The Mennonite Quarterly Review

VOLUME XXII APRIL 1948 NUMBER TWO

CONTENTS

EDITORIAL 74

FAITH AND REASON: THE PRINCIPLES OF MENNONITISM RECONSIDERED, IN A TREATISE OF 1833 75
Translated and Edited by Robert Friedmann

MEMOIRS OF AN AMISH BISHOP 94
Translated and Edited by John Umble

ANABAPTIST HISTORIOGRAPHY IN THE SCHOLARSHIP OF TODAY 116
Donovan E. Smucker

TOPICS FOR RESEARCH IN MENNONITE HISTORY AND LIFE 128
J. Winfield Fretz and Melvin Gingerich

A CHAPTER FROM ALTERNATIVE SERVICE IN RUSSIA 132
Johann P. Bueckert

BOOK REVIEWS 135

H. M. J. Klein, *History and Customs of the Amish People*
Charles S. Rice and John B. Shenk, *Meet the Amish: A Pictorial Study of the Amish People*

EDITORIAL

THE NINETEENTH CENTURY WAS A PERIOD OF IMPORTANT CHANGES in the life of the Mennonites. At the beginning of that century there were only two "branches" of the Church in America, the Mennonite and the Amish. By the end of the century there were sixteen or seventeen ecclesiastical groups. This diversity was due in part to the immigration from Europe of Mennonites of diverse nationalities and cultural backgrounds. It was also due in part to schisms both in Europe and in America. The two articles by Robert Friedmann and John Umble are analyses of sources dealing with this nineteenth century development. Heinrich Balzer, the author of *Understanding and Reason,* was an important figure in the movement among the Mennonites in Russia which led to the formation of the conservative group known as the Kleine Gemeinde. David Beiler was an Amish leader in America who declined to follow the movement which led to the formation of the Amish Mennonites. He is therefore an important figure in the history of the present so-called Old Order Amish.

IN THE PAST GENERATION RESEARCH IN ANABAPTIST AND MENNONITE history has made remarkable progress and indications are that interest in the subject is still on the increase. In this issue of the REVIEW Professor Donovan E. Smucker of the Mennonite Biblical Seminary in Chicago gives a summary review of recent progress and J. Winfield Fretz of Bethel College in collaboration with Melvin Gingerich of the Mennonite Research Foundation, at Goshen, Indiana, provide a list of stimulating suggestions for research in various areas of Mennonite history, thought, life, and affairs.

THE BRIEF ARTICLE BY JOHANN P. BUECKERT IS A PORTION OF A communication to Dr. Cornelius Krahn giving a personal account, by a participant, of the alternative service program among the Mennonites in Russia. —G. F. H.

The Mennonite Quarterly Review

Vol. XXII No. 2

FAITH AND REASON: THE PRINCIPLES OF MENNONITISM RECONSIDERED, IN A TREATISE OF 1833

Translated and Edited by Robert Friedmann

Is it possible to speak of a "philosophy of Mennonitism"? At first thought one would answer this question negatively. As yet not even a conclusive "theology of Mennonitism" has been formulated, although it has frequently been attempted. How then is it possible to present the simple, unsophisticated faith of the Anabaptist-Mennonite fathers in a philosophical frame? To do so would seem a contradiction in terms. And yet the remarkable essay presented here in an English translation, represents essentially such an undertaking. Its author is Heinrich Balzer, a Mennonite minister, who in his later years was associated with the Kleine Gemeinde (Mennonite), in Orlov on the Molotschna (Russia). Balzer writes entirely in the spirit of the sixteenth century founders. And yet, he approaches his subject, the decline of the Mennonite Church and the possible means of its internal revival, not from a theological angle but rather from a semi-philosophical one. He does not primarily preach morals, or the sinfulness of a world estranged from God, but he tries to prove that the root of these evils (which today we would call "secularism") must be found in a confusion of two seemingly abstract concepts: *Verstand* and *Vernunft (understanding* and reason). These terms, however, represent more than mere philosophical concepts; they indicate attitudes, frames of mind, basic evaluations of approaches to the problems of life. It appears that the author was not unfamiliar

with the philosophical trends of his time, particularly with German Idealism[1] and the rising liberalism in thought and science. He is conscious of all this, but looks at it not from the inside as one of their number, but from another level as one who deplores this way, and criticizes it. In his Christian mind he sees the hand of the great Enemy in the success of these "humanistic" developments. The use of the afore-mentioned concepts in his argument, making them responsible for historical developments, is the outstanding feature of this essay. In a sense the entire argument is a great indictment of modern civilization which is founded on human reason rather than on faith in God's grace and guidance. The ancient teaching of the Apostle Paul, taken up by the Anabaptists and Mennonites, "not to conform oneself to this world," has found here a quasi-philosophical vindication.

The Christian faith in its concrete, existential form, as a living frame of mind, is submitted to a stimulating analysis, not in the way of Schleiermacher, the idealist, who calls faith a "feeling of absolute dependency"; but rather in the way of Pascal, the believer, who calls faith the "reason of the heart" *(raison du coeur)*. Balzer, who hardly knew this seventeenth century French Catholic religiosus, nevertheless speaks the same language, calling faith the *Verstand des Herzens*. All deviations from the path of pure and genuine discipleship result from an overcultivation of reason, something which since the days of the Renaissance has been called *Humanism*. To this Humanism "man is the measure of all things," and not God. When reason becomes dominant in all spheres of life, faith, or (intuitive) *understanding* as the author prefers to call it, is watered down and eventually destroyed. Naturally, reason is useful in the daily affairs of life, and therefore merits acknowledgement; it is man's "natural light" and as such it also is a gift from the Creator. But beyond this scope reason, if unchecked, holds dangers in store. It is destructive rather than creative through its techniques of analysis, doubt[2] and unrestrained curiosity. Thanks to human ingenuity, science and technology have brought us all the way to the atomic weapons, but little demonstration is required to show that in this process God has been lost, and that today the powers of darkness dominate the scene.

[1] The teachings of the great thinkers Immanuel Kant, Fichte, Schelling, Hegel, and Schleiermacher. German Idealism is a rational metaphysics making the *Vernunft* (reason, Logos) absolute.

[2] Renes Descartes, the founder of modern rationalism, made systematic doubt of our knowledge the fundamental method in philosophy or, more correctly, in epistemology.

In spite of shortcomings presently to be discussed, Balzer's study is by and large sound, providing a possible philosophical foundation for the Mennonite faith as it was developed by the early Swiss Brethren and Menno Simons. After two thousand years of Christian as well as secular history we still face the same antithesis and the same dilemma. Two sets of values guide our lives which do not quite agree, one comprising the divine and eternal, reaching beyond man's capacity, and the other one encompassing the rational and secular, giving man self-assurance and pride of intellectual autonomy. Modern man is hardly willing or capable of denying the secular in favor of the Christian set of values. But he should become more aware of the hidden temptations and dangers of the secular way, though it is certainly not an easy task to keep from making human reason an absolute and last instance. Balzer, of course, knows these problems very well. Although using a semi-philosophical language he nevertheless endeavors to stay on that other level from whence he can judge the world of reason. He does so by virtue of his *understanding*. But he knows that the temptations of reason are continually creeping into his mind. In the last chapter of his study he warns against higher learning for the youth, quoting Paul's statement that "knowledge puffeth up" (I Cor. 8:1).[3] And then he continues: "Everyone knows by his own experience the tremendous difficulties in this denial of one's reason and intellectual autonomy, a denial so much needed for salvation and yet rendered so hard by misunderstood education and enlightenment." What a problem for our entire educational philosophy!

That Balzer was quite in line with original Anabaptism can be proved by an unexpected coincidence. In his section on "Scriptural Testimonies" he quotes Paul in II Corinthians 10:5, as an outstanding witness for his thesis: "bring into captivity every thought [*Vernunft*] to the obedience of Christ." It is reassuring to find that in 1571, Peter Walpot, a Hutterite Elder, used exactly the same text as his chief argument against Polish anti-Trinitarians (Unitarians), the rationalists of his day. A comparison of Walpot's letter (published in the *Geschichtbuch der Hutterischen Brüder)*[4] with Balzer's philosophical essay shows a good deal of

[3] Who would not think here of the well-known attitude of the Amish who try to prevent their children from going through high school, not to speak of college?

[4] See Robert Friedmann, "Reason and Obedience: an old letter of Peter Walpot (1571) and its meaning," *Menn. Quart. Rev.* XIX, 1945, pp. 27-40. The inner connection of Walpot's letter and Balzer's study is indicated by similar titles "Obedience and Reason," when discussing Walpot, and "Faith and Reason," when discussing Balzer. Actually Balzer seems to continue Walpot's arguments. The two documents have much in common.

conformity. It is true that in his study Balzer does not make obedience the center of his argument as Walpot so emphatically does. But in his farewell hymn, to be quoted later on, obedience becomes a cardinal principle to Balzer also.

Likewise Pilgram Marpeck, although educated and versed in theological controversies, does not think very highly of secular learning and that which it implies. In his letter of 1544 to Caspar Schwenckfeld he speaks pointedly of "the unlettered son of a carpenter whom your philosophy has fabricated into such a high Christ." It would be easy to multiply such quotations against *Hochgelehrsamkeit* (secular learning). It is obvious that Balzer is quite in line with a tradition of his church though he did not know it.

Although philosophical in his approach, Balzer was not trained in abstract thinking, and for that reason his study shows shortcomings which make interpretation and translation difficult. First of all his expression and style is often cumbersome and involved. In the translation it was necessary to break up long sentences and to reformulate statements the meaning of which was somewhat confused or hazy. Occasionally it was necessary to risk even a guess rather than to omit the passage altogether. Secondly, Balzer tends toward a certain oversimplification which brings the issue too much into a strict antithesis of black and white. Certainly, the blending of Christianity into Western Civilization is a much more complex phenomenon than it might appear from Balzer's fervent appeal for simplicity, nonconformity, obedience, and husbandry (as the most conducive occupation for an earnest Christian).

Thirdly, Balzer is not quite consistent in the use of his two basic concepts *Verstand* and *Vernunft,* the description of which is at times vague and somewhat iridescent. One might plead, however, that it is here where Balzer shows his typical German background. For to a German (particularly of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries) these terms are very popular though used mostly in a different way, usually taking *Verstand* with the meaning of *Vernunft,* and vice versa. No comparable antithesis or combination of terms exists in the English language.[5] Accordingly, our

[5] It was a consolation to find that other translators faced the same difficulty. When Professor Otto Manthey-Zorn of Amherst College began to translate Kant's *Fundamental Principles of the Metaphysic of Ethics* (published by Appleton-Century press, New York, 1938) he, too, had to decide how to make this German peculiarity of thinking intelligible to English readers. In his excellent introduction he writes on this subject (pp. viii-x): "The differentiation between *Verstand* and *Vernunft* [so much used by Kant] is most troublesome for us. Both of these terms we translate quite properly by 'reason,' and in English there is at least no popular distinction between them or rather there are no English terms that can express the difference as im-

translation was faced with a serious handicap which needed to be overcome if the text was to be intelligible. Fortunately the author presents in section IV a series of "Scriptural Testimonies" which provide a lead to an adequate translation. Wherever Luther in his German Bible used the word *Vernunft* (Balzer inconsistently has *Verstand),* the King James' version uses the term *understanding.* As a matter of fact this *understanding* is something different from faith (though related to it) as well as from understanding as it is used in everyday language. Yet, it comes the nearest to what the author wanted to convey. To prevent confusion and ambiguity, however, and to indicate that the word stands here as a technical term with a special meaning, it will be printed in the present context always in italics.

In concluding these introductory remarks, a brief synopsis describing the deeper meaning of the basic antithesis of the essay is in order. By *Verstand* Balzer means man's cognitive faculty behind his faith, knowledge through faith, or in other words, the faculty to know God and His truth. Another term for the same principle is *understanding (Verständnis)*; another is "the mind as illuminated by the Holy Spirit." We might repeat here again Pascal's "reason of heart" by which he does not mean emotion or sentiment, but rather a vision of the eternal truth. Sometimes in English it is also called a "sense for eternal values," although it is a sense only in a figurative way. Actually it is a mental faculty, a capacity of understanding and judging. It is always of an intuitive character and not discursive. That is what makes its description so difficult.

On the other hand, what Balzer calls *Vernunft* and what is translated here as reason, is the faculty behind our reasoning. It is the "reason of the head," the intellectual frame of mind which does not seek values and eternal truths but rather scientific relations and laws. In Biblical language it is the "natural light." It gives man a strong consciousness of his intellectual autonomy and

mediately as do the German terms. The two terms do overlap in German and even in their use by Kant himself." He then goes on to interpret the two terms "*Verstand* (in German philosophy) is the rational faculty as applied to the experience of the senses; its adequate translation would be reasoning or thinking. *Vernunft,* on the other side, is something quite apart from experience. It is the supreme human endowment and faculty of finding principles; it is the source of ideas and ideals. It supplies the unconditional to the conditioned reasoning, and it is the faculty that enables man to act in accordance with supreme principles. It is reason proper. . . . It is the German equivalent to our ordinary appeal to sound 'common sense [this I would challenge—R.F.]. Since reason is wholly independent of experience, Kant objects to calling it a sense. It is an endowment not unlike to what we call a 'high moral sense.' Compared with it *Verstand* then is the 'lesser reasoning.' The ideas of reason produce the 'intelligible world,' whereas reasoning deals but with the world of experience." So much then for our philosophical comment. From a Biblical standpoint the distinction would most likely be drawn up in a different way.

power. In philosophy and the liberal arts it functions as the main tool. In the great decisions of life, however, it leads nowhere; therefore doubt and skepticism are its natural outgrowth. Both faculties are necessary to man. Their mutual relationship and possible confusion, as well as the resulting effects, will be the main theme of the following study.

A few words should also be said about the author and his manuscript. Not much is known about him. He was a preacher of the Mennonite Church in Orlov on the Molotschna as mentioned above. In his congregation he faced a double temptation: On the one side was a trend toward rationalism, liberalism, and a watering down of Christian principles in favor of secularism and full participation with the world. On the other hand was emotionalism, pietism, and a form of private edification and sanctification, which Balzer likewise declined in good old Anabaptist fashion. Both these trends are discussed in the following study. There remained a third way, however, and it was this which attracted his attention and eventual consent. This was the conservative way of strict adherence to the Biblical commandments and to the pattern of the forefathers. In 1812, one Claas Reimer and a few followers had withdrawn from the main church body and started the Kleine Gemeinde on extremely conservative foundations.[6] Today this Kleine Gemeinde still exists, more or less in its original form, mainly in Manitoba, as a little island which has resisted the march of time.[7] A major issue in the controversy between Claas Reimer and the main body of the Mennonite Church in the Molotschna was the question of service on the local police force. In other words, could Mennonite Christians perform the functions of the secular authority in the administration of their autonomous colonies? Balzer alludes to this controversy in his last chapter. In his criticism of the church Reimer certainly was on Biblical ground, but in his fanaticism he overreached himself and accordingly failed to obtain a large following.[8]

[6] At about the same time a similar schism occurred in America leading to the formation of the Reformed Mennonite Church under John Herr. The contemporaneousness of these two events is a surprising coincidence. The "Herr-Leute," too, are very strict and conservative.

[7] Later on the Krimmer Mennonites separated from the Kleine Gemeinde, affirming that joyfulness has a rightful place in the Christian's life. The Kleine Gemeinde opposed all joyfulness as a worldly temptation. In America many of the Kleine Gemeinde united with the Church of God in Christ Mennonites (the Holdeman group).

[8] See C. Henry Smith, *The Story of the Mennonites* (Berne, Ind., 1945), pp. 422-425. Smith quotes a pamphlet of 1838 with five main points of disagreement between the Kleine Gemeinde and the main body of the Mennonite Church in Russia.

In 1833, Balzer decided to leave his old church and to join the Kleine Gemeinde. We learn the reasons for this step from a long farewell hymn of fifty stanzas written in 1833, and published by John G. Stauffer of Quakertown, Pennsylvania, in his periodical *Die Gemeinde unterm Kreuz* (September, 1886). From it we reproduce the following lines by way of illustration.

Gottes Geist sprach unablässig in mein Herze durch sein Wort:
"Du musst von der Welt dich gänzlich reissen . . .
Willst du zu dem Leben gehen, so muss ich dich folgsam sehen."

Abgeteilt ein kleines Herd'chen hiess er schon seit ein'ger Zeit
Aus der grossen Zahl der Mächt'gen sich aussondern durch Bescheid.
. . . Diese Herde ist ganz eigen, sie besteht aus freier Wahl,
Jeder unter ihr muss zeigen, dass er ist ein Glied der Zahl [derer]
Die gehorsam wollen sein und sich üben zart und rein,
Nach des Herren Wort zu schmücken, und im Kreuzesweg sich bücken.

The treatise on *Verstand und Vernunft* was written at about the same time as the above hymn. One might guess that it was intended as a vindication of Balzer's decisive step which might easily have been interpreted as a lack of love or care for the larger church of which he was a minister. In this treatise, the author sets forth his vision of the "true" Christian church and its need for strictness. In the concluding chapter he even develops a kind of program for such an ideal church.

The text upon which the following translation is based also has an interesting story. The original manuscript, which had never been published, was in the possession of Abraham T. Friesen, a teacher of the Kleine Gemeinde in Manitoba.[9] Friesen made a copy (of 44 pages 4°) and sent it to John G. Stauffer, an independent Mennonite publisher and printer of Quakertown, Pennsylvania. The latter printed the treatise in his then widely read periodical, *Die Gemeinde unterm Kreuz,* in five installments, from May, 1886, to January, 1887. Nothing is known regarding response by the readers. Since the print was rather poor, the style difficult, and the ideas new and unfamiliar, the publication most likely escaped wider attention. A manuscript copy of unknown origin was also found among the papers of John F. Funk of Elkhart, Indiana, and is now in the Mennonite Archives of Goshen College. For these reasons Balzer's treatise in its present form might rightly be called a rediscovery and a genuine enrichment of our knowledge of Mennonite thought and literature. Its contents, moreover, constitute a genuine challenge, and deserve wider discussion.

[9] The Friesen family originally came from Danzig. At that time the name was Von Riesen, but later it was contracted into Friesen. See Cornelius Krahn in the *Mennonite Weekly Review,* February 20, 1947 (Youth Page).

UNDERSTANDING AND REASON. SIMPLE OPINIONS REGARDING THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN *UNDERSTANDING* AND REASON, DISCUSSED ACCORDING TO THE TEACHINGS OF THE GOSPEL

By a teacher of the Mennonites in the Molotschna [Russia], 1833

[Heinrich Balzer][1]

I. Introduction

Each century has its particular way of attacking the Christian truth of salvation. The great Enemy of mankind [Satan] is tirelessly busy in an effort to destroy the Kingdom of the Light as the history of Christendom so clearly shows. The first centuries of our era give ample proof of this conflict of the true faith with the adversaries of Christianity who so vehemently denied the divinity of Jesus. At a later period the Enemy attacked the fundamental truths of the Gospel by blending them with secular philosophy against which the witnesses of truth had to strive with great labor and pain. Still later [during the Middle Ages] the Enemy tried to deceive [*überlisten*] the church of Christ with many erroneous doctrines, human laws, the teaching of "sanctification by works," and the adoration of saints. For a while the true teachings of the Gospel were almost buried under this rubble. Modern times again supply ample proof that the Enemy has found even more refined ways and means to overthrow the great evangelical truths. Unfortunately, the history of the church shows that the Enemy has been rather successful with these tricks. There exists an acute danger of a complete overthrow of the Kingdom of the Peace of Christ; like a slow pestilence the Enemy penetrates all of Christendom with this deadly disease, making it unhealthy in faith and numbingly cold in love. For that reason our Saviour says, "When the Son of Man cometh, shall he find faith on earth?" (Luke 18:8; Matt. 14:12). Inasmuch as injustice increases the love of many will grow cold. The result of this baleful disease is quite obvious for every friend of the truth. To trace the origin and location of this pestilence, however, requires the combined art and skill of all the physicians of the spiritual Zion. And they certainly need the great truth in order to apply the proper remedy once they have found the roots of all these ills.

To find them is not too difficult if you but look with a simple mind at the present condition of Christianity. You might ask me what, after all, constitutes the core of this great ill? To this I have to answer as follows: the Enemy has succeeded in dazing the simple eye of faith by confusing the faculty of the heart [*understanding*] with that of reason.[2] In this confusion I recognize the very source of all the trouble. In teaching the truths of the Gospel the apostles worked for the growth of *understanding* of the heart, whereas modern times stress primarily the development of reason [*Vernunft des Kopfes*]. This is an evil because it slowly and softly coaxes, stuns, and deludes Christendom, cancerously eating up all the fundamental truths of the Gospel. By this the stage is being set for the rising of the "son of perdition who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God" (II Thess. 2:3, 4).

[1] All additions in brackets are by the editor and translator.

[2] *Die Ausbildung des Verstandes wurde mit der der Vernunft verwechselt.* Concerning the distinction between *Vernunft* and *Verstand* see the introductory remarks.

Also in our own Mennonite Church the Enemy has been successful not only by breathing upon her this fatal disease so that the center already suffers its consequences; but also by boldly attacking the Christian simplicity of our faith with the purpose of overthrowing our basic principles. For all these reasons I, the lowest of the guardians of our church, feel constrained in love and duty toward my brethren and coreligionists to call their attention to these facts, to insistently warn them, and to prove to them with the holy Word of God my simple understanding that the ever spreading great corruption of entire Christendom has its very source in the confusion of these two forces: *understanding* and reason [*Verstand* und *Vernunft*]. In the following pages I want to present to my brethren my good advice as to how to work against this corruption and its consequences. It is my deep desire to contribute by this writing at least a small stone to the construction of the spiritual temple of Zion; to stem the insidious attack of Satan; and to assist in the healing of our church from all these creeping ills and bringing her back to the original and firm foundations of our holy forefathers. For our goal is to reach one faith and one knowledge of the Son of God. Only he is a perfect man who follows the perfect example of Christ. Amen.

II. Man Is Created to a Threefold Life of the Body, the Soul, and the Mind

From the holy Word of God we learn with many proofs that the life of man has a threefold character: first is the physical life; second the life of the soul or [rather] of the senses; and third the spiritual or mental life. According to the terms of the Scriptures we could also say that man is built of body, soul, and spirit. The physical or, as we also could call it, animal life animates our body, makes it moving and fit to all the functions of this world; if it is taken away the body falls down and is dead. This physical life man has in common with all living creatures. The psychic or sensual life is of a totally different character, since it is immortal and dominates the physical life. This second life, or, what amounts to the same, the human soul evinces its activities through thinking [reasoning], and governs and directs the physical life by way of the five senses. As a matter of fact other living creatures also show this kind of life, only with this great difference that the all-bountiful Creator has endowed the human soul with reason, the natural light, by which man can reasonably consider the affairs of this world, judge his own actions, and make a good and rational choice between right and wrong.

The third, the mental or spiritual life, too, was given to man by his Creator. It represents that part by which the great Lord has tied Himself the closest to man, and by which man received the greatest privilege of all creatures. However, because of man's disobedience to God's commandment, the warning (Genesis 2:17), "In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die," came true, and this life died and was lost. Through the resurrection of Jesus Christ, however, this faded out [spiritual] life was retrieved and made available again to the reborn ones. The true knowledge, or the "reason of the heart" [*Verstand des Herzens*] is revealed through the inspiration of the Holy Spirit to those who genuinely repent from their sins, deny them [*ihnen absterben*], and conduct their lives in accordance with the word of Christ in whose redemptive death they believe. Out of grace the Father of Light will give them the right wisdom and ***understanding.***

III. The Great Difference Between "Understanding" [Reason of the Heart] and Reason [Natural Reason]

The mind of man, or his *understanding,* consists in a true and correct knowledge of God's will regarding man, as it has been revealed clearly and simply in the Holy Scriptures. This mind becomes illuminated in a reborn person through the divine power of the Holy Spirit, and the more a man opens his heart to the working of the Spirit of God, the more the mind will be illuminated and inspired. For it was through the fall of man that his *understanding* was darkened. Eph. 4:18.

Reason, on the other hand, is a natural light with which the good Creator has endowed the soul of every human being to a greater or smaller extent. This reason was not lost through man's fall; yet in consequence of the fall it became corrupted in such a way that a man who indulges in the vices of sin will become quite foolish [and irrational] in his actions and judgments. This natural reason is restricted exclusively to activities of this world; that is, to what one can see, judge, test, and decide upon. These are the affairs to which natural reason applies and in which it can be of great avail as a useful light. But that which belongs to our salvation, and which according to the Scriptures can be grasped only through faith, requires a simple obedience to the Gospel that lies completely beyond the limits of reason. Furthermore, because of the deep fall of man by which he became corrupted in body, soul, and mind, the [natural] reason also was spoiled and became outright hostile to God and His will. Therefore, in a reborn and faithful heart, animated by the inspiration of the Holy Spirit alone, this reason must be subordinated to the faith, and be brought under its obedience [*Kindschaft des Verstandes*].

IV. Scriptural Testimonies and Proofs Regarding the Antithesis of "Understanding" and Reason[8]

Of the Lord Jesus, Luke says that "all that heard him were astonished at his understanding and answer" (Luke 2:47). Likewise the Apostle Paul says of himself, "Whereby, when ye read, ye may understand my knowledge in the mystery of Christ" (Eph. 3:4). And in the epistle to the Colossians (1:9) the apostle points out that he does not cease to pray for the believers that they might be filled with the knowledge of God's will in all wisdom and spiritual understanding. Somewhat later (Col. 2:2) he professes his struggle that their hearts might be comforted, being knit together in love and unto all riches of the full assurance of understanding to the acknowledgement of the mystery of God the Father and of Christ. Again the apostle comforts his beloved disciple Timothy with these words: "The Lord give thee understanding in all things" (II Tim. 2:7). And finally the Book of Revelation says this: "Here is wisdom. Let him that hath understanding count the number of the beast" (Rev. 13:18).

These texts may suffice to prove that the saintly authors of the New Testament had a high opinion of the *understanding* [or mind] of man, and that they saw their main duty in its development through the preaching of the Gospel, as well as through prayers that the Holy Spirit might illuminate the believers. On the other hand, what the New Testament has to say about [natural] reason shows that this reason is considered as belonging to a lower rank, in no way of the same class as *understanding,* and not to be confused with it. Rather, the attainment of salvation requires the denial and the taming of the reason and of other natural endowments without, however, restricting their use in their own domain. It is the same as with

our body: we cannot do without it, and yet it must remain subject to the will of the reborn man. The following texts give the clearest testimony to this point.

In II Corinthians 10:5, the apostle exhorts the believers of Corinth: "Casting down imagination and every high thing that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God, and bringing into captivity every *thought* to the obedience of Christ."[4] In Ephesians 2:3 we read: "Among whom also we all had our conversation in times past in the lusts of our flesh, fulfilling the desires of the flesh and of the mind,[5] and were by nature the children of wrath, even as others." And the great benediction of the Epistle to the Philippians (4:7) says: "And the peace of God which passeth all understanding[5] shall keep your hearts and minds through Christ Jesus." Col. 1:21: "And you that were sometimes alienated and enemies in your mind by wicked works . . . ." On the other hand, the Apostle Peter discusses the domain of natural reason as follows: "Likewise, ye husbands, dwell with your wives according to knowledge"[5] (I Peter. 3:7). And since it appears a matter of fact that believers, sanctified by the Holy Spirit, would not give their body to any licentiousness, the Apostle Paul beseeches the brethren in Rome (Rom. 12:1) that they present their bodies "a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God, which is your reasonable service" [Luther: *vernünftiger Gottesdienst*].

V. Comparison and Contact of the Two Faculties of "Understanding" and Reason and Their Consequences

Understanding, or knowledge of the heart illuminated through the Holy Spirit,[6] moves man by its convincing power to accept all those teachings of the Gospel which are necessary for salvation. It is only by way of simplicity of faith [*Einfalt des Glaubens*] that these teachings can be adopted by man and made a firm part of his mind. What reaches far beyond all concepts of the wise men of this world and their philosophy is made understandable to man by the grace of the Spirit of God through illuminated knowledge [*erleuchteter Verstand*] in Christ Jesus. Through this faculty of *understanding* [faculty of faith] man receives the deepest insight into

[3] Here our translation meets an unexpected handicap since the Lutheran German Bible, used by Balzer, renders the text often with quite a different meaning than the English King James version. Compare, for instance, the remarks in notes 4 and 5.

[4] II Cor. 10:5 in Luther's translation, "Nehmt gefangen alle Vernunft unter den Gehorsam Christi." The English Bible speaks of the captivity of every *thought* where Luther uses *Vernunft* (reason). This changes the meaning since reason is stronger than thought (or opinion). To a student of the English Bible this text would hardly appear as a fit argument, while it represents a very strong point for the reader of the German Bible.

It is highly significant that Balzer uses this quotation as a witness for his thesis. More than two hundred sixty years ago the Hutterite Elder Peter Walpot used the same quotation in a similar context as a defense of the strictness and order of his church. It was almost his main argument. Compare Robert Friedmann, "Obedience and Reason: an old letter by Peter Walpot (1571) and its meaning," *Menn. Quart. Rev.*, XIX, 1945.

[5] Luther has *Vernunft* (reason), using the term inconsistently, once for *understanding* and once for reason proper. The King James version on the other hand uses in these quotations five different terms, namely, thought, understanding, knowledge, mind, reason. Balzer's antithesis is best represented by the couple: *understanding* and reason.

[6] *Der Verstand, oder—was eines ist—die durch die Erleuchtung des Heiligen Geistes gewirkte Erkenntnis des Herzens.* Blaise Pascal uses in his *Pensées* (published after his death in 1662) time and again the term "reason of the heart" (*raison du coeur*) for the same idea. The English term *understanding* is somewhat ambiguous.

the otherwise inaccessible light of the mystery of God (I Cor. 2:9, 10), and is redeemed from the dominion of darkness. It transfers man into the Kingdom of the Son of God and prepares him as an heir of eternal salvation.

Reason, on the other hand, is a natural light and (with a few exceptions) is common to all men. Through secular learning it can be developed to a high degree. Whatever goes beyond its concepts and judgments, reason puts to doubt; the truth of salvation in and through Christ is to it nothing but folly. Reason considers itself strong enough to make man live a virtuous life; it teaches him [self-contained, autonomous] morals, and for that reason promotes pride, conceit, and complacency. It is true that reason shuns vice; but at the same time it does not oppose sensuous drives and the appetites of the flesh. Reason tends after conformity with this world; is passionate in all enjoyments of life; but sullen, impatient, and irritated in affliction and suffering. The more refined and enlightened reason becomes through secular learning, the more it doubts and opposes the working of the grace of the Holy One in man, thus making man a very fit citizen of this world. If God would not discipline man through law and conscience, reason would work itself down to greatest folly and unreasonableness, merely by its unchecked and limitless sensuous lust. This was more clearly proved by the [history of the] first world [before Christ] and likewise by the philosophies of the heathen.

VI. Simplicity Is the Very Element of "Understanding," but to Reason It Is Obnoxious, Since Reason Works Through Sensations, and Can be Led Astray Through Imagination or Fancy

The grace of the Holy Spirit convinced the believers of the first centuries in their *understanding* and knowledge of the heart that they would live more happily in this world by giving themselves completely to the simplicity in Christ. In this way they received the grace of God in abundance, and thus managed to live in this world bearing poverty, misery, contempt, exile, affliction, and tribulation. Brotherly love made them like a great family, and no one wished a privilege for himself at the expense of another. Worldly honors, high repute, elated rank, and the pleasures of social life they regard as vanities, as mere sham and smoke. The lowest rank in society seemed to them the fittest. They shunned company with people of high standing in this world, and rather kept to the lowly and poor. The riches of this world they held detrimental to salvation; their greatest joy was to support their poor coreligionists. Reading and writing they considered as a useful training for the propagation of the Gospel. Higher learning, however, worldly scholarship and philosophy, they eschewed and fled intentionally. They delighted in the simplicity of God's Word but were ignorant of sophistication. In their inspired *understanding* they considered the affairs of this world not as their particular domain, and therefore were far from hurting anybody for the sake of gain in this field. On the contrary, they rather preferred to suffer injustice and to allow themselves to be deprived and destituted of their belongings. They waived all claims in this world, and there is not one instance in the history of the early Christians that they resisted violence. They found fault if anybody among them pleaded for possession in this world, for they knew all too well that their kingdom was not of this world. That is what we call "living in simplicity."

On the other hand, reason finds such a life almost unbearable. Its endeavor is always "enlightenment"; its aspiration, reputation in this

world; its happiness, a great amount of riches; its treasure is gold; its unrest is pursuit of dominion; its drive is worldly honor and position. Men of this type find their way rather by search into the mysteries of nature and reflecting upon them; their method is observation, analysis, experimentation, and logical deduction. Through their imagination they come down in their standards until they commit follies obvious to everyone. To such a life flattery is most pleasant and applause delightful. The simple Word of God is too naked and too meager for the intellectuals, and they are bored by a simple sermon expounding that Word. But all those sensuous, pretty, and made up "truths," or rather lies, they find most useful in the entertaining and education of the people; and they prefer any fictitious (or even true) story, if only nicely dressed up, to the plain Word of God. Diversions of every kind, comedies and other [stage] plays, they like and find most enjoyable. If they suffer any harm they get aroused and cry for vengeance and reprisal. They disdain acts of violence, but to get one's claim through litigation they find all right; and, if need be, to defend one's right even by force they find completely in accordance with the Gospel. Whatever in the teaching of the Lord Jesus and His apostles disagrees with reason is polished away by sophistry and cleverness. Their love does not reach farther than to equals. To love one's enemy and to do good to those who offend you seems to them like a thorn in the eyes. With perspicacity and meditation, reason follows every trail toward the perfection of earthly well-being, and its main spring of action is self-ishness. To think of death is a bitter pain to reason, and it is prone to scoff at hell and eternity as long as an acute conscience does not convince it day by day. Heavens are of little interest to reason, and it knows no greater pleasure and delight than the lust of the flesh.

VII. The Effects of "Understanding" Can Be Observed in the Heart of Man; Those of Reason, However, in His Head

Understanding animates the heart of a believer, and it is here that one can observe best its consequences. When in a reborn heart the Holy Spirit exclaims the "Abba, our Father," divine gifts effuse into the believer and enter his *understanding.* They fill him with a new wisdom and a knowledge of Jesus Christ. The more and the freer the heart of man is opened to the Spirit the more knowledge will he gain, the greater riches of divine gifts will he receive, and the more will his heart be prepared as an abode of the Triune God. It is the inward man, as the Holy Scriptures call it, which has been revived by the resurrection of Jesus Christ. And it is this newborn man who through faith in the Lord keeps striving after greater perfection in the growth of grace, life, and *understanding;* in other words, he works toward a growth in sanctification. If man concentrates upon his heart (the faculty of the inward life), he experiences in his prayers and sighs a contact and conversation with God. It is by this experience that the Holy Spirit reveals to human *understanding* the true and correct knowledge of God's intentions toward man through Jesus Christ, and thus makes man obedient to His divine will. The effect of this *understanding* in Christ Jesus will soon spread from man's heart to all his actions and make him fit to carry on a divine (or sanctified) life in simplicity and truth.

The changes, on the other hand, which are effected by the influence of reason can be observed in man's head and the organs of his five senses. As long as man stands outside the influence of the Holy Spirit—either because he is not yet capable to receive it through repentance and change of heart, or because he has left it in weakness, distraction, or lack of alert-

ness—he lives in the natural state, and stands under the guidance and influence of reason only. This can be easily recognized by watching the source from which one's willing is directed, whether it is the heart or the head. Is he slow to prayer and rather attracted by worldly things which make it hard for him to think of God and His holy words? Then one can certainly draw the conclusion that this man is not standing in the divine life but rather governed by natural reason. With a certain amount of self-introspection man quite distinctly perceives the psychic or the sensuous tendencies in his thoughts which work everything up in the head and passionately penetrate also the lusts and appetites of the flesh.

VIII. It Has Been to the Harm of Christendom that Man Has Confused the Development of These Two Faculties of Our Soul; for Thus the Early Simplicity [of Christian Life] Has Been Lost

As long as Christians tried to live pure and simple lives according to the teachings of the Gospel, with the view alone toward eternity, they carefully avoided conformity with the world. The development of heart and *understanding* was their main concern, and for that they needed no other rule and guidance than the plain Word of God, and (of course) prayer. They mutually instructed and exhorted each other, and edified each other in brotherly love. Education of the children was one of their main concerns and they observed a strict and firm discipline of the church [*Gemeinde*]. To that end the church received plentifully the needed gifts through the Holy Spirit; that is, through the inspiration of the *understanding*. Ample proof of this are the bold speeches and the deep insights of the poor and unlearned fishermen of Galilee, by which they defended themselves against high and low; they demonstrate that these men had actually reached a high degree of knowledge [of the divine things].

But when men began to blend the simple teachings of the Gospel with all kinds of interpretations and expositions, and to match them with philosophical tenets, then they began to conform themselves to this world in all things; and from that time on the main thing was not the development of heart and *understanding,* but of head and reason. Everyone studied much of science, for everyone wanted to be the most learned, the most enlightened, the most honored, the most respected one. In order to most perfectly attain this end they established universities and schools of higher learning where worldly scholarship found a home, and where the cultivation of reason found mighty sponsors. Even the heralds of the Gospel were taken hold of by this passion for worldly learning, and they confused and mixed up *understanding* and reason, the cultivation of the heart and the enlightenment of the head, to the greatest harm of Christendom. Rationalism was declared the greatest triumph of Christianity.[7] Christian simplicity was labeled mere ignorance and dumbness, and the genuine evangelical faith was looked upon as an absurd superstition. On the other hand, they implanted into the Christian churches sophistication and unbelief with all their destructive effects.

[7] At this point it is good to keep in mind that this treatise was written around 1833, at a time when a wave of "liberal" philosophy and "rational theology" swept Europe. David Friedrich Strauss' *Leben Jesu* (1835) might be called the representative book of this trend. It takes away the divinity of Christ and humanizes Him.

IX. In Menno Simons the Church Received a Worthy Tool for the Restoration of the Simplicity of Christendom in Its Original Purity

No reformer of the sixteenth century visualized the old simplicity of the early church more convincingly than did Menno Simons, the revered reformer of our church. Thanks to the inspiration of the Holy Spirit he recognized with the clear eye of *understanding* the pernicious error of [official] Christendom, and shunned all secular learning and all conformity with the world. He left his former estate [of priesthood or clergy] and turned to a flock of poor, lowly, and despised confessors of Christ. Firmness, humility, simplicity, and dauntlessness made possible his great undertaking to stand against tremendous odds steadfastly and never wavering. Under the rubble of the many errors of [historic] Christianity he rediscovered the simple teachings of the Lord and His apostles (which had been muddled by human interpretation and reasoning), namely, that believers should not think of vengeance, resistance, oath, secular learning, and the great things of this world, but rather should keep always to the lowly and meek ones. To our great blessing he restored again the simplicity of the early Christians in its original purity. In these teachings the church [*Gemeinde*], which he collected, found such a peace of mind and heart that it feared neither tribulation nor death, neither fire nor sword, but firmly and steadfastly defended the simplicity of the Gospel through suffering and nonresistance.[8]

X. In More Recent Times the Spirit of This World Entered Also Into Our Church with Its Cunning to catch It by Way of Reason, and Now Threatens to Deprive It of the Simplicity of the Fathers and to Lead It Into the General Corruption of Our Times

As long as our church lived under persecution and oppression, the unadulterated teachings of the Gospel were upheld with much blessing. The Lord awakened her men who resisted the intrusion of the Enemy with vigor and vision, thus firmly establishing the fundamental principles of the church. But as soon as the church began to enjoy peace with the world, and even protection and privileges, Satan succeeded in entering it and ensnaring the former simplicity of Christ in order to catch it. Infatuated by reason and the riches and good things of this world, members of the church began to consider these things as no longer harmful for salvation, and therefore tried to obtain them by every possible means. One became enmeshed in big business and thus assumed duties and responsibilities which made worldly learning unavoidable. One necessity engendered another, and one need gave rise to a next one. The big trading connections made it absolutely necessary to study business administration, geography and political science. Reading of daily newspapers became a necessary and tempting habit, and made people familiar with the great politics of this world. They thoroughly enjoyed observing revolutions and the overthrow

[8] Notice the brevity of this section and the absence of any quotation from Menno Simons' writings. It appears as if the author had but a faint idea about Menno Simons and his works. A knowledge of Mennonite history hardly existed at that time although both Dutch and German editions of Menno Simons' works were available among the Molotschna Mennonites. In view of this general ignorance of the primary sources one has to welcome this testimony of allegiance to the origins and to the spirit of the fathers of the Mennonite Church. Basically Balzer is right with his historical argument.

of kings and states.[9] Thus many of our good Mennonites gradually became conditioned to the doings of this world without even noticing it. This new secularism also produced the desire for a better, that is a more refined education for their children. These members, being at home with the world and having gained distinguished ranks, naturally also wanted learned preachers with higher education, who in turn changed the church in its very foundations, making it more conformed to this world. Eventually there was a desire for full equality in privileges and freedoms with all the other denominations.[10] To this end the principles of the Mennonite Church were adjusted to the requirements of this world by way of rational arguments so that civil and war services could now be accepted without hurting one's conscience.

God be thanked that our church here [in Russia] has not yet come that far. [10a] To a certain extent, however, the Enemy has been successful even here in bringing the church into fermentation by this "leaven" of conformity and equalization, and in confusing the old simplicity of the holy forefathers, and in catching it stealthily in the snares of reason. The peace of the church has been destroyed.[11] Pride, ostentation, vanity, greed for money and lust for wealth, avarice, drunkenness, luxury, vicious life, masquerades, obscene songs, gambling, and above all the miserable smoking of tobacco—they all have become passionate habits of the Mennonites to such an extent that in their denial they would not even recognize any praiseworthy advantage over the pitiable Nogaians[12] who know no greater bliss in this world or in the hereafter than the gratification of their lusts. That it has come thus far in our church truly taints the revered name of Mennonite.

XI. Conclusion. [The Organization of the Ideal Christian Church.][13]

It certainly is contrary to our tested principles for one member of the church to give strict orders to another one (who serves as a liaison officer to the authorities) and in case of disobedience and obstinacy bring him before the congregation to have him excommunicated and considered an unworthy

[9] Balzer wrote his paper at a time when Europe was going through a series of violent revolutions and upheavals. In 1830, Paris saw the so-called July Revolution when Charles X (Bourbon) was dethroned and Louis Philippe of Orléans was made king. The same year saw a revolution in Brussels, and the breaking away of Belgium from Holland (August to November, 1830). Also Poland had its first national though abortive revolution at this time (1830). A bloody Polish-Russian war followed (1831). Much unrest against the Metternich system pervaded many countries of Europe.

[10] What was the author thinking of at this point? One should guess primarily of Russia where privileges were so much in the foreground of discussion. But the next paragraph seems to contradict it. In Holland the Mennonites enjoyed full equality; in Prussia the church had great privileges, as yet unchallenged.

[10a] In 1833.

[11] This seems to allude to the split among the Molotschna Mennonites between the main body and the *Kleine Gemeinde* under Claas Reimer (1812) which Heinrich Balzer joined in 1833.

[12] Nogaians, a native tribe of nomads in Southern Russia who had their grazing grounds near the Molotschna, and thus had come in close contact with the Mennonites. Much strife ensued. Cornelius Cornies, the famous Mennonite agronomist, tried hard to teach the Nogaians husbandry and a settled life, yet with little success. See any Mennonite history, for instance the book by J. P. Friesen (1911).

[13] This supplementary title has been added to clarify the subject of the concluding chapter which is less theoretical and more practical. Balzer was, of course, thinking of the *Kleine Gemeinde* as such an ideal Christian church.

member.[14] The ban, however, should be used with all the authority proper to it, for there is no stronger discipline than shunning. Since the church [*Gemeinde*] of Jesus Christ considers itself here in this world not as a world citizenry but rather as a spiritual people directed by powers from above, it develops through the ministry of the Word a spiritual priesthood as well as (among members) a spiritual brotherhood. There are no other offices. Members who serve the worldly affairs of the church should consider themselves only as liaison officers between the authorities and the elders [bishops] who direct the ministry of the Word [*Lehrdienst*]. They must never think of themselves as separate, so to speak secular functionaries with any kind of authority to arbitrarily direct the church according to the laws and powers of the state. Inasmuch as they are brethren in the church, such an assumption would mean an act directly against our tenets and would involve the destruction of our spiritual fellowship.

One should not forget the exhortation of the Apostle Paul in his Epistle to the Romans (12:16): "Mind not high things, but condescend to men of low estate." The lowest estate, that of a husbandman, is the most conducive one for the preservation of genuine simplicity in Christ. In it we can find a plentiful livelihood through industry and diligence under the blessing of God. And we should be satisfied in finding food and clothing; striving after greater wealth or a position of high distinction in this world would spiritually be only too harmful for the church. For expansion in [the realm of] the good things of this world certainly entails a restriction in spiritual benefits. "What is a man profited, if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul?" (Matt. 16:26). Goods of this world beyond the standards of our assigned estate are surely incompatible with the simplicity of our holy forefathers and the teachings of the Gospel, for they demand something from man which he cannot possibly fulfill in loyal pursuit of our principles. And therefore, once he has grown fond of these things he is ready to sophisticate [*Künsteln*] the truths by means of reason, to reformulate them in ambiguous clauses, and at the end to find them altogether dispensable, rather than to part from the goods of this world.

As to the school system one must be on the alert lest the young flowers of our church become biased against our principles which later on would make it difficult for them loyally to follow our tenets. In particular one should be on guard not to expand the necessary instruction beyond such subjects as reading, writing, arithmetic, singing and anything else useful and handy for the simple practice of a husbandman. Whatever belongs to higher learning brings forth nothing but sophistry, unbelief, and corruption of the church; for "knowledge puffeth up" (I Cor. 8:1). Reason gets its strength and sustenance from this learning, and soon simplicity is bound to be abandoned. Therefore I counsel and implore each member of our church to make it not too difficult for his own child to find his salvation in innocence. Everybody knows by his own experience the tremendous difficulties in this denial of one's reason and intellectual autonomy [*der eigenen Höhe*], a denial so much needed for salvation, and yet rendered so hard by misunderstood education and enlightenment. Once in this way the young man can be pulled out from the craze [*Taumel*] of this world only with harm and loss, much pain and anguish, and perhaps never. I Cor. 1:26, 27.

[14] Apparently the author alludes here to a concrete case of the church in the Molotschna where the relationship to the tsaristic regime was often rather strained. According to Balzer no ban should be used in cases of that kind. Church discipline has to be reserved exclusively for moral offenses, theologically speaking for sinful behavior.

The discipline of the children should be taken care of with evangelical earnestness. They should be supervised as much as possible lest they fall into all kinds of pleasures and company at an early age; also so that at weddings and other such occasions they are not prompted into wild and turbulent doings so obviously in contradiction to our publicly confessed principles. I implore and heartily advise you not to be indifferent in these matters, as much as it is pleasing to the unregenerate man, and as much as human reason might label it harmless entertainment. Sometime we will be required to give a strict account of all our doings.

[I must also give warning against another danger of the life of this world.] One often comes into contact with other denominations[15] which contend that serving in the army and in civil service, that practicing the sword, oath, and vengeance are quite evangelical. Among them one meets members, be it by correspondence or personal contact, who are genuinely awakened and confess a strong faith in Christ Jesus. Now then, be on your guard lest you fall into the error of undervaluating your own principles out of courtesy, brotherly love, and misunderstood impartiality, and in the end accept a confession strictly opposed to these principles. Otherwise one easily grows accustomed to everything springing from reason (and to what is pleasing to our corrupt nature) so that one hates to let it go. The excuse is always at hand that one has kept the faith in Christ Jesus (although this faith has been nothing but a hiding place). It is so easy to comfort oneself by saying that in the last analysis everything depends on just this faith and nothing else.[16] Satan might well allow such a confession of Christ, a confession that one believes, even if one does not practice the works of Christ. An earnest Christian will never separate faith and works. As surely as he founds his salvation exclusively on his faith in Christ, so surely he also endeavors to fulfill the commandments of the Lord; otherwise all his faith is vain. Let no one be deceived by the argument: If others can accomplish it, I too can do it. "Whatsoever is not of faith is sin" (Rom. 14:23).

We certainly do not judge other Christian confessions; they stand or fall before the Lord. They act according to their faith and their knowledge, and they will have to give account for both. For us [Mennonites], however, who have this particular knowledge through the grace of God, having accepted it on our knees as the very truth of the Gospel, it is and remains once for ever our duty and responsibility to stay loyal to our confession in word and conduct. This one heed well!

Salvation is received in grace through faith in Jesus Christ only, for salvation is nowhere but in Him. The Judge, however, on that day [of judgment] will judge, beautify or condemn, exclusively according to our works. Here is wisdom; happy the man who can grasp it with a simple heart. "Everyone be certain of his case and doubt not, for he that doubteth is damned" (Rom. 14:23). It is nothing but doubt and hypocrisy if I publicly confess to believe one way, but privately speak and act another way. A spoken doubt of mine prompts in my weaker brother (who leans upon me)

[15] The Southern Ukraine was the area of settlement of a good number of German colonists, almost exclusively Lutherans. A lively contact existed between these Lutherans and the Mennonites. See again any history of the Mennonites in Russia.

[16] An unmistakable allusion to the German Lutheran Pietists. It was just this Pietism which later on effected a strong revivalistic movement among the Mennonites (Pastor E. Wüst and the *Brüdergemeinde*). The *Kleine Gemeinde* was strictly anti-Pietistic (somewhat like the Amish church in America); in other words, it followed more the old Anabaptist pattern of church life and piety.

a kind of certainty and, chainlike, works on to other brethren until it becomes a complete certainty of which I myself have been the cause. Thus I become guilty before God.

One must be on guard in the selection of one's reading material, particularly if the book is nicely made up, and makes a strong appeal to both the converted and the unconverted, be it true or fictitious. That which is externally tasteful easily undermines the taste for the simple things and for the Word of God. Eventually it displaces the original simplicity in Christ, particularly with our adolescents. Still farther goes the effect of reading newspapers. It is the intention of Satan to condition these young people for the doings of this world, and they will be captured by this fabric of truth and falsehood which is always so pleasing to the senses. I exhort and admonish everyone to take care of that, both with the youth and with himself. Reason is striving for an all-out victory, and Satan will not rest until the simplicity in Christ (as it exists here and there) is choked up, or at least suppressed, until that which still prevents the full revelation of the Enemy be done away altogether.

Since it is primarily the ministers[17] who are responsible for the upkeep of the principles [of our church], it is absolutely necessary that they should counsel the church in love and harmony regarding the recent events,[18] and that they discuss and establish their respective arguments in mutual regard and concord. Different opinions on subjects apart from our basic principles should be considered as valuable and useful, and no one should despise another for his views. In case of approaching danger God's grace will open the eyes of one or another brother that he may enter more understandingly into the truth and become more conscious of it than others. It is up to these [particular] members to stand on the walls of the spiritual Zion and blow the trumpet of alertness and vigilance, and to take care of all affairs in mutual love. And it is up to the other members to test their message in peace and love, and to become attentive to the voice of God [in them]. Above all, however, one must be on guard against any lack of love or mutual regard. Love works unity; unity gives firmness; firmness protects decline.

"I counsel thee to buy of me gold tried in the fire, that thou mayest be rich; and white raiment, that thou mayest be clothed, and that the shame of thy nakedness do not appear; and anoint thine eyes with eyesalve, that thou mayest see. He that hath an ear, let him hear what the Spirit saith unto the churches" (Rev. 3:13-18).

[17] Balzer says *der Lehrstand* which would mean the "rank of teachers." He meant, of course, "teachers of the Word of God," what we today call minister (or preacher). In the title of this tract Balzer calls himself a "teacher," but in his long farewell hymn he speaks of himself as "preacher."

[18] Apparently the split and constitution of the *Kleine Gemeinde*. Compare note 11.

MEMOIRS OF AN AMISH BISHOP

Translated and Edited by John Umble

This article presents a translation of a manuscript completed in 1862 by the Old Order Amish bishop, David Beiler (1786-1871), who lived near Bird-in-Hand, Lancaster County, Pennsylvania. The manuscript was discovered in possession of S. D. Beiler, of Hutchinson, Kansas, by Dr. C. Henry Smith, of Bluffton, Ohio, and copied by him on July 11, 1922.[1] Later the manuscript was printed in a thirty-five page pamphlet.[2]

In addition to Beiler's memoirs, as contained in the manuscript, the pamphlet presents (1) "Eine Abschrift von einem Schreiben von Dienerversammlungen gehalten in Pennsylvania und Ohio" (A copy of a writing about ministers' meetings held in Pennsylvania and Ohio), written by (old) Bishop Christian Yoder, known as *der alte Christel,* pp. 15-25; (2) further account by Bishop Christian Yoder, the younger, of transactions which followed the Conference held at the Glades on October 3, 1830; (3) a report by Bishop Hannes Yoder of a Wayne County, Ohio, conference held May 25, 1831, pp. 25-28; (4) the resolutions passed at a conference of Old Order Amish ministers and bishops in Lancaster County, April 20, 1864, p. 29; and, finally, (5) some of the genealogical data contained in the Beiler manuscript and a few additional bits of family history added by a later writer, pp. 30-34.

The material has value not only for its genealogical and historical data but also for the light it throws on the gradual separation of the Amish congregations into Old Order Amish and Amish Mennonites. It is one of the very few extant accounts of this separation from the pen of a strict adherent to the Old Order. David Beiler reflects with nostalgic longing on the good old days when members walked barefoot to the Sunday morning preaching service, when old and young, especially the young people, kept busy at hard manual tasks, and when congregational life and discipline existed in their simplest forms. Surrounded by vast economic and sociological

[1] The copy in the Mennonite Historical Library at Goshen College was made from Dr. Smith's copy under the direction of Harold S. Bender in 1929.

[2] The title page of the pamphlet bears the following: "/Eine / Vermahnung oder Andenken / von / David Beiler / (Gestorben [Geboren!] 1786.)/" "/Prüfet alles und das Gute behaltet. Meidet allen / bösen Schein./" It presents no date, no indication of the publisher or the date of publication. At the end of the pamphlet (p. 35) is the following notation (freely translated): "Copied and submitted for printing in 1928 from Bishop David Beiler's own handwriting. He was born July 3, 1786, and died March 3, 1871, aged 84 years, 7 [8?] months, and 27 days."

forces which he cannot understand, he retreats into the simple pattern prescribed by the rules and regulations *(die alten Ordnungen und Regel)*, drawn up by the early Swiss Brethren and confirmed by later Amish conferences.[3] The solution to every new problem is easy for him: simply enforce the strictest interpretation of these rules and regulations and place under the ban all who refuse to conform. What causes him genuine concern, however, is the failure of some ministers and bishops to agree to this course. When they demand Scriptural reasons for certain measures of discipline and for the age-old interpretations, he accuses them of hair-splitting and decries secular education as the cause for the rise of an inquiring, investigative spirit that questions the authority of the bishops.

Viewed from this standpoint the controversy between the Pennsylvania and Ohio bishops regarding the rebaptism of Mennonites who wished to unite with the Amish, is enlightening. The bishops in the older more self-contained Amish communities in Pennsylvania presented a lengthy dialectic to prove that such applicants must be rebaptized. The Ohio bishops who had received them without baptism said, "You do not realize what worthy *(tugendhafte)* people these are." The Eastern bishops decided the question on the basis of tradition; the Western Amish, forced by the struggles and dangers of the frontier to mingle and co-operate with their neighbors and thus to become acquainted with the stranger even though he was a Mennonite, recognized him as a brother and received him into membership without rebaptism. Even though the Pennsylvania bishops succeeded in "proving by the Scriptures" that the tradition was right, the Ohio bishops, fearful of the reaction of their people if they would proceed by rule, exacted and received a promise from the Pennsylvania bishops that they would not be required to do such baptizing themselves but might call in some other Amish bishop to perform the ceremony for them.

Another case of the influence of the frontier, "the spirit of the West," is the refusal of Ohio Amish to observe the ban against an excommunicated member after he had united with a Mennonite or Dunkard congregation without first conforming to some strict rule of the Amish and making the public confession before the assembled Amish congregation which would have restored him to fellowship in his own group. The strict old order, on the other hand, would have required that he be "shunned" to his dying day

[3] See the introduction to the present writer's article, "Catalog of an Amish Bishop's 'Library,'" in THE MENNONITE QUARTERLY REVIEW, XX (July, 1946), 230-9, especially pp. 230-1.

unless he both conformed and made the required confession. This growing liberalism of the western congregations annoyed and disturbed Bishop David Beiler. His keen analysis was correct: departure from the old order meant an irreparable breach in the church. The next decade witnessed the widening of the breach until "Old Order Amish" and "Amish Mennonite" were accepted by each group as a distinctive name. The rift which the fathers had sensed with growing alarm during the thirties, forties, and fifties and which they had tried unsuccessfully to repair in their conferences, widened into a chasm across which there was no return to the old order by those who had chosen the new. Whole congregations, enjoying the freedom of the new order which discarded beards and long hair for men, replaced hooks and eyes with buttons, and exchanged the broad-brimmed hat for the more comfortable winter cap, swept their reluctant ministers and bishops away from the traditional patterns of church and community life. In some sections, some congregations retained the old order, while some gradually left it. Some congregations split, even across family lines. Some, about 1860, allowed a few slight deviations from the old order, then held the line for thirty years. In Wayne County, Ohio, for instance, only a few families adhered to the strict "old order" when the congregation erected a meetinghouse in 1862, but the "progressive" majority retained many of the marks of the old order—the hair cut, hooks and eyes, and a strict interpretation of shunning—until 1890 when the ministers in order to avoid a disastrous division reluctantly allowed a committee of laymen to draw up a "new order" which the congregation unanimously accepted.

Little is known of Bishop David Beiler except from Shem Zook's *Eine wahre Darstellung* (1880) and from three manuscripts penned by Beiler himself. The first manuscript, *Das Wahre Christentum, Eine Christliche Betrachtung nach den Lehren der Heiligen Schrift. Verfasst von David Beiler, Lancaster County, Pa.,* was completed in Lancaster County, in April, 1857, in his seventy-first year. In 1888 it was printed posthumously by John Baer's Sons, Lancaster, Pennsylvania. The copy in the Mennonite Historical Library was purchased in 1889 by [Bishop?] J. Gascho, of Ontario, Canada.

This printed volume of three hundred and one pages contains a preface, twelve chapters, and a table of contents. The style is simple, straightforward, and deeply devotional. Beiler's discussion of the various topics shows an intimate knowledge of the Scriptures and a keen analytical mind. It abounds in Old and New

Testament illustrations from which he constantly draws practical applications. The titles of the chapters indicate the range of his interests and the usually practical nature of his discussions: "An Exhortation to My Children"; "A Discussion of Baptism"; "Of Christian Marriage"; "Of Revenge or Resistance"; "On the Swearing of Oaths"; "On Placing a Member Outside the Counsel" (a step short of excommunication); "A Meditation on Matthew 18"; "A Meditation on John 3"; "Of the State of the Soul After the Death of the Body"; "A Meditation on Matthew 24 and 28"; and "A Meditation on Luke 12: 58, 59."

Simple and unembellished as his writing usually is, he does, however, at times dwell on theological or metaphysical themes. He states as his conviction, in regard to the incarnation of Christ, that He came in human form and with human sense limitations, "but not, as scholars believe, that he received his flesh and blood from [the Virgin] Mary."[4] He discusses the nature and offices of the Three Persons of the Trinity. He grows eloquent when he lists the names given to Jesus and dwells on His work and character. He is chiefly concerned with the simple walk of the believer but he is deeply distressed *(bekümmert)* because he sees among the brotherhood those who think it is sufficient to manifest lowliness in their outward behaviour and to observe the ordinances. The book deserves the attention of scholars who would become familiar with Amish modes of thought and the character of their preaching.

The second manuscript from the hand of David Beiler was written to Jacob Schwarzendruber, of Iowa, in answer to the latter's request for any of Beiler's written forms for administering the ordinances and performing the rites of the church.[5] In Beiler's reply from Bird-in-Hand, Lancaster County, Pennsylvania, on his seventy-fifth birthday, July 3, 1861, he stated that he had no written forms but that he could remember back sixty years and that he would report, according to his best knowledge, the forms that the old forefathers used. Then he writes the following in full: method of ordination and the charge given to the bishop, the bishop-deacon, the minister, and the deacon; the marriage ceremony and vow; the restoration of a fallen member into fellowship; and setting an erring member back from communion until he gives evidence of reformation. In his salutation Bishop David Beiler addresses Bishop

[4] David Beiler, *Das Wahre Christentum* . . . , p. 12.

[5] This manuscript, on pp. 71-75 of the Jacob Schwarzendruber manuscript collection in the Mennonite Historical Library at Goshen College, is mentioned as Item XV in "Catalog of an Amish Bishop's Library" in The Mennonite Quarterly Review, XX (July, 1946), 235.

Schwarzendruber as "Friend, Brother, and Fellow-Minister." Before moving to Iowa in 1851, Schwarzendruber had been a minister in Somerset County for eighteen years.

The third David Beiler manuscript, his memoirs mentioned above, is translated in this article.

Another reference to David Beiler is found in Shem Zook's *Eine Wahre Darstellung* (p. 12). There he states that when Bishop Solomon Beiler, of Mifflin County, wished to introduce "baptism *in* the water," a committee, Levi Miller, of Holmes County, David Beiler from Pequea (Lancaster County, Pennsylvania), and Abner Yoder from the Glades, Somerset County, were appointed to resolve the difficulty. These three ministers met with the Mifflin County congregation in May, 1851, but did not succeed in uniting the discordant elements. David Beiler advised that if applicants for baptism insisted on baptism *in* the water, they were to be dissuaded from it and the minister was to impress upon them that it would cause discord and dissension. Then if they still insisted on baptism *in* the water, the ministers were to take the counsel of the congregation. His remarks on this occasion agree in general with others of his statements that indicate his willingness to work with the congregation on matters of general policy. Tradition records that David Beiler and his brother, Solomon, the Mifflin County bishop, seldom agreed on vital issues but that David Beiler and Bishop Abraham Pitsche, of Mifflin County, a staunch adherent to the Old Order, were good friends and collaborated in the work of the church.[6]

Following is a translation of the manuscript containing the memoirs of Bishop David Beiler written in 1861-62 when he was seventy-five years old. The rendering, to retain something of the flavor of the original, is literal even when sentences are either run-on or incomplete. The punctuation in the manuscript is sometimes confusing, sometimes nonexistent, and that of the pamphlet is full of palpable errors. Some of the sentences in both are incomplete. Many hang loosely without marks of any kind.

AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF DAVID BEILER (1786-1871)

This writing I, David Beiler, began on March 10, 1862. It deals with the genealogy of our ancestors, who all were foreign immigrants. It is as follows:

My great grandfather, named Jacob Beiler, came to this country on October 8, 1737. But how large a family he had I do not know. He was Swiss.

[6] The present writer is indebted, for this information, to John A. Hostetler, of Mifflin County, who is doing research on some of the early Mifflin County ministers.

My grandfather, Christian Beiler, was still young at that time, perhaps nine or ten years old. He became old, perhaps eighty-seven years. He was twice married. His first wife, named Yoder, was my father's own mother. He left six children, two sons, of whom my father was one, and four daughters. By his second marriage he had four children, three sons and a daughter.

My father, Christian Beiler, was born November 24, 1752, and died November 16, 1811, aged 51 years, 11 months and 22 days. When he died he left five living children.

On my mother's side my grandfather, named Samuel King, also was an immigrant but from what place I do not know. Nor do I have any certain information as to which year he came. As I am informed, he did not become old, perhaps not fifty years old, but yet he left a large family of eight sons and six daughters all of whom left surviving children. My maternal grandmother whose maiden name was Yoder became old, but I cannot say for certain how old; I believe some eighty years. I have not been able to learn the birth date of my mother, Anna Beiler. She died in September, 1816. I cannot give her age for certain but perhaps upwards of sixty years.

Now I will also tell about my wife's ancestors as far as my knowledge goes. I found in our family register an item dated August 11, 1732, opposite a name, Hein Ulrich Fischer. Whether this was the ancestor of the Fischer family from Germany I cannot say for certain but it is probable that he was the great grandfather of the now living Fischers. Her [my wife's] grandfather, as I am informed, was Christian Fischer. He did not live to be very old for, as I am informed, he died from a fall from a horse. He left two sons and five daughters. The name of my wife's father also was Christian Fischer. He was born April 26, 1757. He was twice married. The maiden name of his first wife was Yoder and the second was named Susana Sauder. Her birthday was May 10, 1757. Her [my wife's] father, Christian Fischer, became old—died November 19, 1838, aged 81 years, 6 months, 24 days. He had when he died nine children, seventy-eight grandchildren, and sixty-three great grandchildren. My wife's ancestor on her mother's side was Sauder, also, as I am informed, an immigrant. My wife's grandfather was Heinrich Sauder, born in 1722 and married on March 20, 1745, to Barbara Staufer who was born April 27, 1724, died November 27, 1791, aged 67 years, 7 months, and one day. Heinrich Sauder died October 25, 1811, aged 89 years, 5 months. Susana, daughter of Heinrich Sauder and wife of Christian Fischer, died December 28, 1831, aged 74 years, 4 months and 18 days.

Now I will also report regarding all of Christian Fischer's household and children [sic!]. He had two sons and eight daughters of whom all except two left surviving children. By this time (1861) they have become a rather large number, perhaps 335 living persons from one ancestor.

Now I will also tell about my parents' household. My father and mother had ten children of whom five died in infancy and five grew up and had households and children. I will now tell how much this family has increased (1861) to about two hundred.

Now I will also tell about my brothers and sisters. Samuel Beiler was born May 30, 1777, and died May 29, 1788, aged ten years, eleven months and one day. Jacob Beiler was born January 17, 1779, and died July 14, 1849, aged 70 years, 5 months and 28 days.[7] Christian Beiler

[7] This Jacob Beiler is the present writer's great-grandfather. He spent the last years of his life in Union County, Pennsylvania. After his death his daughter, Lydia,

born November 29, 1780, died January 29, 1788, aged seven years, 7 months and 28 days. Elizabeth Beiler born April 14, 1783, died February 14, 1788, aged four years, 10 months and 4 days. Hannes Beiler born September 9, 1784, died March 2, 1868, aged 83 years, 7 months and 24 days.[8] I, David Beiler, was born July 3, 1786 (died March 3, 1871, aged 84 years, 8 months).[9] Abraham Beiler was born February 28, 1789, and lived one year and 28 days. Jonathan Beiler was born September 27, 1791, and died August 6, 1878, aged 86 years, 10 months and 10 days. Vrene [Frances, Fanny, Veronica] Beiler was born August 13, 1794, and died March 13, 1802, aged 7 years, 7 months and 10 days. Solomon Beiler was born July 18, 1798, still living (1887).[9]

Now I will also report [on the children] of my father-in-law, Christian Fischer. Barbara Fischer, now Kinig [King] was born July 3, 1779, died October 12, [1869?], aged 90 years, 3 months and 22 days.[10] Magdalene Fischer was born September 10, 1786, died April 14, 1850, aged 70 years, 7 months and 4 days. Catharina Fischer, now Zug, was born July 19, 1782. Maria Fischer, now Schmucker,[11] was born April 20, 1787 (died April 18, 1876, aged 79 years, 11 months and 27 days).[9] Christian Fischer was born February 26, 1789 (died January 31, 1874, aged 84 years, 11 months, and 11 days).[9] Elizabeth Fischer, now Beiler, was born January 19, 1791, and died September 4, 1866, aged 75 years, 6 months and 16 days.[12] Ana [sic] Fischer now Stoltzfus [sic],[13] was born October 22, 1793, died October 10, 1870, aged 76 years, 11 months and 18 days. Susana Fischer, now Stoltzfus,[13] was born November 10, 1795, and died March 19, 1852, aged 56 years, 4 months and 9 days. Ester [sic] Fischer was born May 10, 1798, and died May 4, 1820, aged 6 days less than 22 years. Benjamin Fischer[14] was born February 14, 1801 (died September 2, 1878, aged 77 years, 6 months and 16 days).[9]

Now I will also tell about our own children. Christian Beiler was born September 8, 1811, and married Rebeka [sic] Stoltzfus January 12, 1834. Both are still living. Johannes Beiler, born June 27, 1813, married

married the widower, Deacon Christian Stoltzfus, the writer's maternal grandfather. See John Umble, "The Amish Mennonites of Union County," in THE MENNONITE QUARTERLY REVIEW, VII (July, 1933), 166-67.

[8] For Hannes Beiler see THE MENNONITE QUARTERLY REVIEW, VII, 165-66. Jacob and Hannes Beiler were elder brothers of Bishop David Beiler, the writer of the manuscript.

[9] Some of the figures in parentheses were added by Samuel Beiler, a son of Bishop David Beiler. In 1887 Samuel Beiler copied the David Beiler manuscript for his son, D. K. Byler, who wished a copy of the original manuscript which had been completed on February 20, 1862.

[10] An error in calculation, apparently, if the dates of birth and death are correct. The year date of the death of Barbara (Fischer) King is omitted from the manuscript.

[11] This was Jacob Schmucker, son of the Swiss immigrant, John Schmucker. Cf. *Mast Family History*, p. 220, where the date of the death of Maria (Fischer) Schmucker seems to be given correctly as 1866. (If she had been born April 20, 1787, and died April 18, 1876, she would have been eighty-nine instead of seventy-nine as the manuscript states.)

[12] This Elizabeth Fischer was the wife of Bishop David Beiler, writer of the manuscript.

[13] The two Stoltzfus' mentioned here seem to have been the sons of Bishop Christian Stoltzfus (1748-1832), son of the immigrant, Nicholas Stoltzfus. Abraham Stoltzfus married a Susanna Fischer, and David, an Anna Fischer. See *Mast Family History*, p. 157.

[14] This may be the Benjamin Fischer who married Elizabeth Lapp (See *Mast Family History*, p. 158, Family 358).

Solme Zug on [January][15] 17, 1836, still living. Susana Beiler, now Stolzfus, born July 5, 1815, married Samuel Stolzfus on February 25, 1834, and died January 28, 1860, aged 45 years, 6 months and 23 days leaving nine surviving children. (Her husband died April 25, 1885, aged 70 years, 11 months and 26 days.)[9] Elizabeth Beiler, now Lapp, was born July 7, 1817, married Jacob Lapp January 13, 1840.[16] She is still living. Jacob Lapp died March 28, 1855, aged 36 years, 5 months, 9 days, Catharina Beiler, now Herzler [sic], was born August 12, 1819, and married Samuel Herzler January 15, 1852. Her husband Samuel died July 22, 1878,[17] aged 55 years, 8 months and 28 days. David Beiler was born December 5, 1822, married Maria Stolzfus [sic] February 1, 1848. Samuel Beiler was born August 6, 1825, married Jemima Herzler, January 31, 1854. Benjamin Beiler was born April 26, 1830, married Maria Ech [sic] January 22, 1857.[18]

Now I will also tell of the children of Samuel Herzler and his wife—write the birthdays of the children. Elizabeth Herzler was born October 17, 1852, Salome Herzler on October 23, 1855, and David Herzler on November 25, 1857.

Now I will also tell of the great changes during these sixty years and more, how it was then and how it is now. Whoever has not experienced it himself can scarcely believe it. It seems to me that both the people and the weather have changed.

First about the conditions in our church, as they were then and as they are now. At that time Christian simplicity was practiced much more, and much more submission was shown toward the ministers, especially toward the old bishops, but how it is now experience teaches us. It sometimes appears to me that it is as we read at the time of the Judges. At that time there was no king in Israel and each one did as he thought right. So it is far too much among us. It is as the prophet says, "The child shall behave himself proudly against the ancient and the base against the honorable." [Isa. 3:5] I still remember well that it was customary to go to church on foot especially the young people, and bare-footed. There was no talk of fine shoes and boots nor did one know anything of light pleasure vehicles in our congregation. The old people who could not walk very well had

[15] Month omitted from the David Beiler manuscript and supplied from the printed pamphlet.

[16] This, apparently, is the Jacob Lapp and Elizabeth Beiler of Family 358, p. 158, of the *Mast Family History*.

[17] Year not given in the manuscript. The date was supplied from the Hertzler genealogy.

[18] At this point (bottom of page 34) the pamphlet continues with the following list of names, some of which could not have been written by Bishop David Beiler:

Samuel Lantz born July 8, 1781, died July 30, 1850. [Possibly the Samuel Lantz who founded the Union County, Pennsylvania, Amish settlement.]

Jacob Schmucker died in July, 1850, aged 65 years, 4 months, 19 days.

Maria Schmucker died April 2, 1866, aged 78 years, 11 months, 6 days. [This seems to be the Jacob and Maria (Fischer) Schmucker mentioned on page 200, Family 554, of the *Mast Family History*. Here the date of death is given, correctly it seems, as 1866.]

Christian Fischer died January 31, 1874, aged 84 years, 11 months, 12 days. [This was the brother-in-law of Bishop David Beiler.]

Elizabeth Fischer [evidently Christian's wife] died January 24, 1874, aged 81 years, 7 months.

David Beiler [the writer of the 1862 manuscript] died March 3, 1871, aged 84 years, 7 months, 21 days.

Elizabeth [Fischer] Beiler [David's wife] died September 4, 1866, aged 75 years, 7 months and 15 days.

BERKELEY BAPTIST DIVINITY SCHOOL
SANDFORD FLEMING LIBRARY

to ride horseback or stay at home. Sixty years ago, among us, fine Sunday shirts or bosom shirts were not in use according to the fashion of the world as is the rage now, nor of wearing all kinds of strange [or odd] colored fine store clothes. One was satisfied with and delighted in home-made stuff. The wives and daughters spent the winter spinning. The flax seed was sown in the spring, and in the fall it had to be pulled, broken and hackled. That was work mostly for the wives and daughters. It was customary to hear the spinning wheel hum or sing in almost every farm house, and where this was not the case people remarked about it as of people who did not do their duty. The large amount of imported goods with which our country is flooded, as also the domestic cotton goods which are to be had at such a low price, have almost displaced the home-made materials so that the daughters who now grow up no longer learn to spin. Oh what a great change this is in the last sixty years.

Now, I will also tell about the farm implements. Sixty years ago we had ploughs that had no metal. They were of wood. We knew nothing at all of cultivators[19] at that time nor of threshing machines or of horse-drawn rakes. That was hand work. In the winter the grain was trampled out by the horses. That was work for the boys. At that time young people were kept at home more, at work. At that time two, three and more months were not employed in the world among relatives and acquaintances, whiling away the time in frivolity, wasting the precious time of grace in telling jokes and in unprofitable conversation. At that time one did not go to school every winter for months at a time. One was satisfied with learning to read and write. It was considered that for the humble state or for the common man more was not necessary. At that time there were not such splendid houses and barns, according to the custom of the world, as at present. One was satisfied with dwellings providing for pressing needs. I still remember quite well that horses were not tied in the stable. The harness also was much more simple and quite different from now. The wagons were not painted. The saddles and bridles also were less according to the fashion of the world.

One knew nothing at that time of cisterns or rain wells, nor of machines to cut sausage meat. Coffee also was not used much but more soup and mush. Preserves were unknown. Going visiting also was not so common; neither were there so many different kinds of food placed on the table. In general, everything was more simple.

At that time there was not so much time consumed in sweeping and decorating houses and much simpler house furnishings were sufficient. Spotted dishes were scarce. The spotted and flowered dishes were in the more pretentious houses and were not to be found with those who kept themselves among the lowly. Sofas and writing desks and bureaus there were none, or rag carpets. I still remember the wooden shoes very well. Leather shoes were considered too expensive. Clothing was much more simple. I verily believe that, sixty years and more ago, if anyone who wished to be a member of the church would have dressed and conducted himself in the high fashion as is too much the case today and would not have heeded the warning of the church, he would have had to be put out of the church as a disobedient person.

Now I will also tell of the congregations sixty years and more ago. According to my best knowledge there were not more than nine congrega-

[19] Not the two-horse cultivator is meant here but the *Schauffelegge,* a single or double shovel cultivator drawn by one horse, directed by a single line or merely by the expletives "Gee" (right) or "Haw" (left). He means, apparently, that all field cultivation was done with a garden hoe.

tions in America, that is, of the members of our faith. The first and oldest, as I am informed, was called the Conestoga, westward of us. The next oldest was the Northkill or Blue Mountain (Blauenberger) congregation. The third was the Big Valley congregation; the fourth, the Chester congregation; the fifth, the Tulpehocken congregation; and the sixth, the Reading congregation; of the other three I do not know which was the first: the Glades, the Conemaugh, and the one on Casselmans River. This may have been about seventy or eighty or more years ago; I cannot say for certain.

The oldest congregations in America may be about 125 or 130 years old, for my great grandfather, Jacob Beiler, and Jacob Mast came to this country in 1737. As I am informed, however, several were here earlier named Kurtz, Garber and Tschans [sic!]. But how long I do not know. I have been told that Kurtz and his wife had no table for a time. They held the dish with their food on their lap.

Nearly all of our ancestors came to this country poor and had to manage with scanty food and clothes and had to live almost in huts. And we, their descendants, live in superfluity, in pride and luxuriousness in dress, in expensive comfortably furnished houses and many lead a sensual life. Our forefathers had to flee and leave their fatherland on account of persecution because they were not allowed to serve God according to their conscience. And we, their descendants, are oft times so lazy and can or will not work or fight against our spoiled manners and our unsound nature so much that what we know is an offense in the church we will not or do not lay aside for the sake of love and peace. If we read ancient history we learn that in the course of time much has crept in that was not good and had to be improved from time to time and circumstances made it necessary to undertake a reformation. So it was also among our ancestors that through paternal love parents were influenced to wink at their children's behavior even though they knew they were not in the order of the church. They even in part supported them. Through this, unpleasantness and discord arose. For this reason the ministers, who were at that time, were led to appoint a conference of the ministers out of all the congregations organized at that time and to make an investigation to see how they were all minded. They dealt with various matters and, as it seemed, they were fairly united. They drew up a set of resolutions and a majority subscribed to them. But some of them seem to have agreed to them because every person has his weak side and perhaps because he did not wish to disagree. Afterwards, however, some of them regretted their action. Through this, disunity arose and it did more harm than good. This, according to my best knowledge, was in 1807 or 1808.

Because population increases and because many foreigners immigrated with strange manners and customs, as time went on, many congregations were organized. So there were often differences of opinion for where there is a large organization there are many varied elements. For it is probably as Paul mentions, "In a large house not all of the vessels are gold and silver, but there are also earthen and wooden vessels, some to honor and some to dishonor." As there are not only fruit bearing vines, so there are not only fruitbearing members. About twenty-three or twenty-four years ago unrest arose about such persons who had been baptized upon confession of faith by another organization but they wished to unite with us without being rebaptized. Because some wished to have them baptized again, people of differing opinions were divided.

About thirty-four years ago there was a minister's conference in the Glades about marriage of nearer relatives than second cousins. It was decided to make no change and remain with the old customs as before.

About thirty-two years ago an attempt was made to allow more freedom than was earlier permitted on the point of marrying nearer relatives (that was in our congregation). It caused considerable discord and dissatisfaction. About four years ago it came up again and they worked hard at it. And finally it came so far that no bans would be published. This was agreed to by some and was pushed through and established. This caused strife and discord and was harmful in the whole church and even yet it is not as it was before.

Thirty-five years ago a cause [of contention] arose at the Halfmoon Valley and Eagles Valley on account of using the power of the government among the brotherhood and it was unanimously decided that that would not be allowed among fellow believers. At that time it was decided that if anyone came so far behind so that he could not meet his [financial] obligations he was to give a true account of his debts—before the congregation, I think. Then the deacon and a trusted brother in the church were to take over his property and sell it and make a distribution as would be just and brotherly. And if it was done in this manner then patience was to be extended to him [*Geduld tragen*] if it did not reach.[20]

My father-in-law once told me that the first time when he wished to marry they were first cousins. Accordingly, the ministers did not wish to give their consent and delayed them for a time because they considered that they were too nearly related. That may have been perhaps eighty-five or ninety years ago.[21]

About ten years ago (and perhaps earlier), there was unrest again on account of baptism. Several wished to introduce a better method. They maintained it was nearer to the Scriptures to administer baptism in the water. This brought forth difference of opinion and discord[22] because our ancestors for many years had administered baptism in the houses and one knew of no other method. Through this, harm arose and disunity which can no longer be brought to a unity. And through such disunity the love of the brotherhood was impaired, confidence was weakened and an occasion given for separation.

Pride and vanity find more place among some people as time goes on because it was a good time according to material things for, among the nations, there was peace and everyone could farm his acre or carry on any honorable business. The old people became rich in natural goods, but, it is to be feared, poor in heavenly riches which, however, are worth more than winning the whole world. And the young people tried to carry on high and to imitate the fashions of the world more and more

[20] *Geduld tragen* was a stock expression meaning "to have patience," "to bear with one." It meant that the congregation would bear with or have patience with a transgressor or offender. He would not, temporarily at least, be denied fellowship or "set back" from communion provided he manifested a submissive spirit and gave evidence of willingness to abide by the regulations of the church or, so far as possible, right a wrong.

[21] About 1750 or 1755.

[22] The controversy over "baptism *in* water *with* water" is discussed in some detail by Shem Zook in his pamphlet *Eine Wahre Darstellung* (A True Account). This controversy arose about 1850. Prior to that, however, there had been difficulty among some of the ministers because certain Amish bishops had received Mennonites into the Amish church without rebaptism. Shem Zook states that a Mennonite had been refused admission without rebaptism in the Kishacoquillas Valley in Mifflin County, Pennsylvania, and that he had been received by Bishop David Zook in Wayne County. Apparently, however, the ministers in Somerset County had refused either this or another Mennonite membership in the Amish church without rebaptism. See Footnote 24 below.

and among some there was little respect for the exhortations and warnings of the old people as it seems. Fifty or sixty years ago, or I will say thirty or forty, there was much more submission shown than now and who reflects what the man says: Whoever does not take advice, he is already on the road of the ungodly. But he who fears God takes it to heart. But whoever defies God besides, he sees God from afar and a wise man notes that he will soon perish. So it is from time to time, as I still can remember very well. The old order has fallen into disuse more and more among some people and in some respects it has no longer been interpreted and followed so exactly. In this way hatred and dissimilarity of interpretation have arisen. Some did not wish to consent to the ordinances which the fathers had any farther than could be shown by the letter of the Scriptures. In this way hairsplitting [or subtle] questions arose, one may well believe. And along with this a presumptuous spirit to meddle in that which was not commanded to all has found entrance and place among some through the secular education which is in high esteem among worldly minded people. In this way one thing after another has crept in so that confusion and strife have arisen. Now as one hears and experiences, there is so much difference of opinion among ministers and brethren and sisters that one can scarcely see or believe. This is as Paul mentions, "We are baptized by one spirit into one body." We know this well that the members in one body are united and peaceful and there is to be no division in the body. If we look at our present-day Christianity, the dissimilarity in our conduct, our customs and way of life we would have reason to conclude that we are not driven by one spirit if the inside is so dissimilar. For as the spirit which rules and directs man so are his manners and customs, his words, his looks and his outward appearance. Through lack of uniformity in opinion it has come so far that divisions and vexations have arisen. The split appears to be becoming almost irreparable. So that if God does not stop this destruction and does not chastise the people in one way or another by cross or tribulation, and perhaps with war and strife and bloodshed, of which there appears already to be a beginning. And we know not when or how it will become otherwise.

If we read through ancient history [Biblical history] we find written that when the people became too evil and forgetful of God then the Lord used other nations as a chastening rod. As he says in one place through the prophets, "Thus saith the Lord, 'I will kindle a fire in you which no one may quench and I will stamp out both the righteous and the unrighteous.'" In another place he calls on Nebuchadnezzar the king to punish disobedient Israel and, therefore, I believe that through these good times in which we had everything in abundance according to natural things we have become forgetful of the great goodness of God. We have grown too cold in our love and careless in the service of God so that lack of uniformity has arisen. The rules which the old forefathers used and practiced no longer are sufficient for some people and they pretend to introduce improvement.

Now there are many congregations and also much dissimilarity which hardly can be brought to unity unless God finds some way or unless he lets something happen which will punish and humble the people, because their stubbornness, their willfulness, and I think I dare also say the lack of repentance is so great among some that admonition, as it seems, makes little impression.

Completed the twentieth day of February 1862 by me, David Beiler, in my 76th year.

I have copied it in the year 1887 for my son, D. K. Beiler, as he desired. Completed April 23, 1887, by me,

Samuel Beiler

Copied from the above copy in possession of S. D. Beiler, Hutchinson, Kansas.

C. Henry Smith, July 11, 1922.

Recopied [by or under the direction of H. S. Bender] December 9, 1945.

There are few significant differences between the main part of the manuscript and the pamphlet. Nearly one half of the typewritten copy in the Goshen College Mennonite Historical Library (the first four of the eleven pages) contains biographical and genealogical data. The pamphlet omits the genealogical material at the beginning and prints it at the end, pages 30-35. Whether the opening sentences printed in the pamphlet were added by a later writer or from another manuscript by David Beiler the present writer does not know. The pamphlet begins as follows.

Because in almost all ages there have been those who wrote happenings or histories and since I take pleasure in writing and have few temporal duties, therefore, I thought because I am rather advanced in years and there are few anymore as old as I am, I thought if no one would have written in past times we would be in the dark on many points.

I can remember back more than sixty years about our church matters, how they were then and how they are now—how at that time Christian simplicity was still practiced much more and much more submission was shown toward the ministers, especially toward the bishops. But how it is now experience teaches us.

At this point, the printed pamphlet continues with Beiler's reminiscences which follow the genealogical material that prefaces his manuscript. The manuscript and the pamphlet are practically identical to the bottom of page 11 of the manuscript and the middle of page 12 of the pamphlet. The manuscript ends at the bottom of page 11, but the pamphlet adds the following paragraphs, evidently by David Beiler.

It is as the prophet says, "My people are tired of repenting to me and as one preaches to them no one raises himself up." Hosea 1:11. [?] And in the fourth chapter he says, "My people are lost because they do not care to learn, for you cast aside the Word of God, therefore, the Lord also has cast you aside so that you shall not be my priest. You forget the law of your God, therefore, I will also forget your children. The more they increase, they more they sin against me, therefore, I will turn their honor to shame."

On May 8, 1862, a general ministers conference was considered very necessary by some, but since not all of the people were of this opinion, scarcely half of all the ministers in the congregations came together. Those, however, who were together, spent the greater part of four days deliberating

and discussing about many matters. But not much was decided how it is to be. But many maintained that a beginning of a reformation had been made. It seems to me, however, there is little evidence of it as far as my knowledge and information goes.[22a]

From the printed report of the discussions, it seems to me that each was allowed to have his own opinion. It appears to me that they made every effort to bear with one another in a conciliatory spirit without coming to the point which was and is the real reason for the differing views. I think that first of all this should be looked after. As the prophet says, "Remove the stumbling block out of the way which leads to my people." According to my opinion, if a true unity is to be, and is, established the place to begin must be with the stumbling block.

If we wish to destroy a weed, we must pull it up by the roots; otherwise it will just keep on growing. Just so it is with evil in the church. If the causes of offense are not put away, then, according to my opinion, no real unity can be restored.

(End of page 13 of the pamphlet.)

Here the pamphlet continues with the aged Bishop Christian Yoder's account of several conferences intended to prevent the drifting apart of the older Pennsylvania congregations and the newer Ohio settlements in Tuscarawas, Holmes, and Wayne counties between 1820 and 1830. The conference of 1826, called to discuss the rebaptism of Mennonites who wished to unite with the Amish, did not take up that question because some of the ministers concerned were not present. This conference, however, did discuss the shunning (Meidung) of an excommunicated member of the Amish Church who later united with the Mennonites or Dunkards without satisfying the Amish congregation which had excommunicated him. The conference decided also against the marriage of nearer relatives than second cousins. This was a departure from earlier practice and caused difficulty later.

Bishop Yoder's account continues with a report of the "big conference" at the Glades on October 3, 1830. He presents in great detail the arguments for and against receiving a Mennonite into the Amish Church without rebaptism.

Then follows a brief account by Bishop Christian Yoder, the younger, of the compromise at the conclusion of the conference and the decisions reached. Young Christian includes in his report an account of another conference held in Wayne County, Ohio, the next spring when his father and some other ministers made a trip to Ohio to help enforce the decisions of the 1830 conference.

The last report printed in the pamphlet is of a conference held in Lancaster County in 1864 by the more conservative Amish

22a Beiler refers here to the first *Allgemeine Dienerversammlung* (General Conference) of Amish ministers held in Wayne County, Ohio, June 10, 11, 12, 1862.

ministers in Lancaster and Mifflin counties.[23] By 1863 this group had decided that the breach between the Old Order and the New could not be healed and had determined to stem the worldward drift by a strict adherence to the old rules and regulations.

A Copy of a Manuscript Report of Ministers Meetings [Conferences] Held in Pennsylvania and Ohio

My dear brethren and sisters in the Lord, my wish is that the dear Lord may give us His holy and good spirit into our hearts so that we may see and accept His word and order aright and not depart from it. To this end may the dear God give us His grace and strength so that we may do as the apostle says, "As ye have put on the Lord Jesus Christ so walk in him and be fearful in nothing." For our Saviour says, "Beware that no one mislead you for many will come in my name and will deceive many." Therefore all who wish to follow Christ should pay heed to the Lord's word and His order and they may not add anything to it or take anything away.

Because great unrest and contention has arisen in our times on account of baptism, namely, that the so-called Mennonites should be accepted among us without baptism, the following incident came up. An unmarried person came from Germany about 1820 who said he was a Mennonite but he wished to unite with our people.[24] However, he did not wish to be baptized because he had already been baptized by the Mennonites. But the ministers declined to receive him without baptism because they had no Scriptural grounds and said they wished to stay by the Word of the Lord and the teachings of the apostles. Then he went away into Ohio, about two or three hundred miles, where he was soon received into membership without baptism. When he came back again, they did not wish to receive him as a brother. Then a great disagreement and unrest arose as was mentioned above. Letters were exchanged and reasons demanded but that was not sufficient for such an important matter. There had to be a meeting to discuss the matter with each other personally.

During this time I was in Ohio twice. Since they had made preparation to hold communion, I was to observe it with them. I said that I feared that I might cause offense among the ministers who held the opposite view. "On the other hand," I said, "if I do not hold communion with you then you will say that I have not considered you at peace." Then they gave me an answer that I thought it was better to observe communion with them. It would tend to peace and not to separation. When I came there the second time it happened that they were ready to observe communion again; then I said, "I will not observe it with you this time, for I am bound to be

[23] A similar conference, held in Holmes County, Ohio, in 1865, was attended by Ohio and Indiana Old Order Amish ministers, also by three from Ontario and three from Pennsylvania. The only Wayne County minister present was Emanuel Hostetler who shepherded the dwindling group which refused to follow the main body of the Oak Grove congregation after the latter built a meetinghouse and departed slightly in other matters from the old order. In 1934 the report of this conference was translated by H. S. Bender and printed with introduction and notes. See H. S. Bender, "Some Early American Amish Mennonite Disciplines," in The Mennonite Quarterly Review, XX (July, 1946), 237.

[24] In Somerset County, Pennsylvania, if *zu unserer Gemein*, the expression used by Bishop Christian Yoder (*der Alte*), is to be taken to mean "in our congregation." See, however, Footnote 22 above.

careful for the other side as well as for you." So it happened that the ministers assembled in conference, as was mentioned above, in the year 1826.[24a]

About twenty ministers came together, but there was not much discussion about baptism. The reason was this—the ministers who had accepted him without baptism did not come. Then it was decided to hold a conference in Ohio the next spring. Two matters were discussed here, however, namely, the ban and marriage.

Because a spirit of freedom came to the fore which undertook to say that if anyone is under the ban among us and is accepted as a member by the Mennonites or the Dunkards then we should not observe the ban against him. Now it should be considered whether this spirit is a spirit of truth or a plant which our Heavenly Father has not planted. This matter was discussed and it was decided that if it happens as the apostle says, "If anyone calls himself a brother and is an adulterer, with him ye shall not work and also shall not eat." I Cor. 15. It should be noted also that not only natural working and eating is to be denied but also the kiss of peace, communion and feet washing together with everything that belongs to these. Now how can one of these forementioned items be disregarded, namely, the temporal items, working and eating, as mentioned above, but the other items relating to the spiritual should remain under the ban. How this can be called a right order of God we will leave to be judged by all right-minded brethren and sisters. We consider this the right interpretation of the ban as the apostle teaches us in II Corinthians, second chapter, where he says, It is enough that such a one is punished by the church so that you may all the more forgive him and comfort him so that he will not sink entirely into despondency. If then, a person comes into such a condition but comes again with a sorrowing spirit and heart then he is to be comforted again. Thus one hopes that by God also his sins are forgiven and remitted. Then the hand of fellowship is to be extended to him again by a bishop in the presence of the congregation and again the kiss of peace be given which had been denied him, for then again all the matters [both temporal and spiritual], as above mentioned, will be resolved and not only one of them. With this interpretation of the ban all the ministers, brethren and sisters, who were present were unanimous [as was determined] by a council (*durch einen Umfrag*).[25]

Further, regarding the marriage state, it was agreed that no nearer relatives should be married unless, on both sides, they were one generation farther removed than cousins or, as one calls them, second cousins. It was reported that such a decision had been reached by a minister's meeting in Ohio. So it actually happened too, but it did not contribute to a solution of the matter for several of the bishops were not present. But it was decided that a minister's meeting should be held in the Glades. This actually took place on October 3, 1830.[25a] Between twenty-five and

[24a] The two resolutions adopted by the 1826 conference are listed also in the records preserved by Jacob Schwarzendruber. See Item XXVIII in "Catalog of an Amish Bishop's Library," in THE MENNONITE QUARTERLY REVIEW XX (July, 1946), 237.

[25] *Durch einen Umfrag.* Voting in an Amish congregation was by voice. The ministers passed among the members of the congregation and received the "yea" and "nay" vote of each member.

[25a] According to Jacob F. Schwarzendruber some of the resolutions passed at this conference were reaffirmed by the 1837 conference in the Glades congregation. Since Bishop Christian Yoder the elder dominated this conference it is likely that all or most of the resolutions adopted by the 1837 conference had been adopted earlier by the conference of 1830. For a translation of the 1837 discipline see THE MENNONITE QUARTERLY REVIEW, VIII (April, 1934).

thirty ministers and bishops out of many churches assembled there. The meeting opened with an earnest prayer that the Lord would lead in the right way and that His will might be done. Then after this, reasons were demanded where one could take it from the Saviour's word or the apostle's teaching to receive a person into church [membership] without being baptized. Then it was presented to us [by the opposition] out of Acts, eighth chapter, verse 5, "But Philip came down into a city in Samaria and preached to them of Christ." And verse twelve, "Then they who believed the preaching of Philip about the Kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ were baptized both men and women." In fourteen to seventeen one sees that Peter and John were sent down from Jerusalem and when they came there they prayed for them that they should receive the Holy Ghost for they had been baptized only in the name of Jesus Christ. Then they laid their hands on them and they received the Holy Ghost. Now from this story of the apostles, Peter and John, [they alleged that] it follows that they had received them and not baptized them.

Accordingly now our answer is: It is well to consider why Peter and John did this, namely, because they already had been baptized by their fellow minister, Philip. For these three apostles, as also the others, received their ministry from the Saviour, one like the other, as one can see in Matthew [tenth chapter] the first and fifth verses and kept the communion service with the Saviour, one just like the other, and the Saviour washed their feet, one like the other. Here we see how the spiritual unity had its beginning and was shown with the works of love by the Saviour and His disciples for our instruction and warning. Since then the ministers in the church of the Lord observe with one another communion and feet washing and whatever belongs to it and conclude with the kiss of peace; there is also, one hopes, the spiritual unity. Accordingly, if one of these ministers administers baptism, none of his fellow ministers baptizes them [the candidates] again, just as the apostles of the Lord, Philip, Peter and John established a precedent for us. So then the reason which they have presented to us, [as a precedent], as explained above, is right and good where it applies but not for receiving without baptism as they do.

In the second place, they quoted out of the twenty-first article of the Martyr Book where it says that if anyone once has received baptism on the true faith [i.e., on confession of faith] according to the teachings of Christ then it is not permitted to baptize again. Our answer is this: the meaning of the entire article is to be considered, not only a few lines, for in the beginning of the article it states how the Lord commanded to teach and to baptize and it says that all who have accepted this teaching have been baptized with water as disciples and followers in the name of the Trinity and have been united with Christ. And it says further that such teachings and commandments are by no means to be changed or to be despised by human judgment but they [disciples] are to live according to them consistently and to show repentance and a changed life. Such are to be baptized with water in the name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost by a minister ordained for that work.

Now one needs to reflect and consider how such a minister must be chosen and by whom, namely, in the way that the apostles did in the beginning. Acts 6:2, "Then the twelve called the multitude together," and in the third verse is recorded, "Beloved brethren look out from among you men of good report." Now from these words of the apostles it is clear and plain that a minister who administers baptism must be chosen in the congregation where he is known as a disciple or brother and he must also be at peace with the congregation and the congregation with him

so that they break bread and wash feet with one another. Now it is also written in that article that the hearing of the divine Word, which is necessary for the souls of human beings and out of which faith and the new birth spring and consequently Christian baptism which Christ added to faith and the new birth and from which one may be separated. And, once more we read in this article, for this reason no one can be accepted as a brother or a sister by the church of Christ and no one can have part in any Christian organization unless he first has received the here-explained Christian baptism on confession of faith according to God's Word.

Accordingly, then, if a minister is chosen according to the teaching of the apostles, as recorded in Ephesians 4:6, and I Corinthians 12:15, that we are all baptized in one body through one spirit and are all given to drink of the same spirit, and if such a minister is chosen in the congregation and baptizes [anyone], then we do not baptize him again, as is written in the article, and as the three apostles, Philip, Peter and John gave us the example, as was pointed out above. These also kept the communion with the Saviour and he washed their feet. Thus it is clear that the article refers to a congregation where they agree in one baptism and one communion.

In the third place, they proposed leaving it to the discretion [of the individual congregation] and said that already for a long time ministers had had patience [*Geduld getragen*] with each other, namely, that whoever wished to receive without [re-]baptism could do so; but whoever did not wish to, could refuse. They held firmly to this position and told what excellent men those [Mennonites] had been [who had been received without baptism[. Very well, but our answer was this. We also would like to do this if the Word of the Lord and the teaching of the apostles permitted it, and presented John, chapter 17, where the Saviour earnestly prayed and spoke in the eleventh verse, "Holy Father, keep them in Thy name whom Thou hast given me that they may be one even as we" (understand he says, as we) and verse twenty-one says, "In order that they may all be one even as Thou, Father, art in me and I in Thee, that they also may be one in us." In verses twenty-two and twenty-three we have, "Those whom Thou hast given me that they may be one even as we are one, I in them and Thou in me in order that they may be perfect in one." So the Saviour makes clear with such words that the Father and the Son are one and accordingly his disciples also should be perfect in one which the apostle Paul expressly teaches in I Corinthians, chapter 1, verse 10. He says, "I beseech you, dear brethren, by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye all be of the same mind and let there be no division among you but that you be perfect in one mind and one opinion." In the fifteenth chapter, verse five, it states, "But God grant you patience that you may be of one mind among each other according to Jesus Christ in order that in one mind you may with one voice praise God the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ."

Thus, now it is clearly seen from these words of the Saviour and of the apostle that the congregations [or churches] of the Lord which are baptized into one body by one spirit, also are to be perfect in one and in one mind and the same judgment. To such a rule the apostle exhorts in Ephesians the fourth chapter, "Be diligent to keep unity in the spirit of peace." Notice, "in the spirit," that is, as the Saviour says, the words which I speak, they are spirit and they are life. Thus we understand that the ministers and the church must be one in the Word. Now it has been clearly demonstrated with the teaching of the Saviour and the Apostles that he who administers baptism must be at peace with the congregation and also must be chosen and ordained in the congregation.

Now the question is where is the authority in the Holy Scriptures that a man may administer baptism in our church who is not chosen and ordained in it and with whom we do not hold communion, nor he with us, neither do we minister with each other [that is, preach from the same pulpit] nor wash feet with each other, nor do we exchange the kiss of peace with each other. Therefore, we avow and prove with the Word of God that all of the above named ordinances belong together and they must all be administered by the one who administers baptism and not baptism alone but everything that belongs to it.[26] Therefore, we leave the matter to those good-hearted brethren and sisters to consider which is the nearest to the Word and order of the Lord. Then we shall readily see that the Mennonite baptism [that is, the baptism administered by a Mennonite bishop] can not be recognized among us because the other above mentioned ordinances are not administered among us by them. Accordingly, their baptism has no right or place among us.

In the second place, it was represented to us [by the opposition] about the seven churches in Asia in Revelations the second and third chapters that they had fallen away to such an extent that the Lord said, "I will spew you out of my mouth," and there one finds no reference to baptism. If they repented they were received without baptism. Our answer is this: This example furnishes no grounds for receiving without baptism. The reason [for receiving *them* without baptism] is this: The apostles Paul and John were in Asia and had ministered to the churches, as one may see in Acts 19:1, "Paul came to Ephesus" and in verses nine and ten we read that he taught daily in the schools and this went on for two whole years so that all who were in Asia heard the Word of the Lord Jesus and verse 26 says that Paul taught not only in Ephesus but also in all of Asia. And Acts 20, verse 4, says that so many ministers traveled with him to Asia and came as far as Troas. And verse 7 says that on the Sabbath day the disciples came together to break bread and Paul made a long address lasting till midnight. There is a reference above to John, whom the Saviour called his servant in Revelation, the first chapter, and he calls himself a brother to the seven churches in Asia and in the Martyr Book it is written that this John was liberated again and came to Ephesus again where he earlier had been bishop over the church and had served the gospel there for fifty-one years and died in peace in Ephesus in Asia when he was eighty years old.

Now, if the aged apostle and bishop lived that long then he certainly also broke bread with the church. Of that there can be no doubt; just as was already mentioned above about Paul that he also had broken bread with the churches. Thus it is clearly shown by the Word that these seven churches in Asia were baptized by the apostles and bishops. Since they were all baptized into one body by one spirit and also broke bread with one another, then they did not need to be baptized again after they were converted and repented as they were admonished in Revelation 2, 3.

Thus far extends the writing which the aged bishop (Hausvater) Christian Yoder wrote and which I, Christian Yoder, Jr. (jung) copied exactly and accurately on February 1, 1839.

Further, this aged, now deceased, housefather himself helped to present before gatherings and conferences these above-mentioned teachings

[26] "Everything that belongs to it." That is, the period of instruction and the special vows that accompany the baptismal rite, such, for instance, as promising to accept the ministry, if chosen and ordained to that office.

and Scriptures of the Saviour and of the Apostles and martyrs and he also taught it [this interpretation of baptism] publicly and held it to be the true order of the Lord. He served in his bishop's office between fifty and fifty-five years and died on April 29, 1838, in his eightieth year.

Further, my dear brethren and sisters in the Lord, I should like with God's help to give you a little additional report of what took place up to the end of the great ministers conference. After all the aforementioned rules and Scripture references, and also many others, had been discussed and after those present had talked them over with each other in a brotherly spirit [*kindlich*], then the bishops from Ohio thought it over seriously. Then time was given them until the next day to think it over. Then they came together again and talked it over with each other afresh. Finally the bishops from Ohio stated that they were at one with us or with this mode of procedure and interpretation and they admitted that it was right and freely admitted that they had more light on the matter than they had before and they did not wush to change any of it and they promised that they would present such a mode of procedure [in baptism] to their congregations and instruct them in it. At the same time, however, they made a demand of the ministers from Pennsylvania that they would come to help them if it should happen that they would not be able to inform [to set right?] their churches on the matter. This the bishops of the conference at once promised. Thereupon the conference ended with hearty thankfulness or prayer of thanks to God.

The next spring the ministers in Ohio demanded of the ministers in Pennsylvania that they would come to their assistance. This they also did. Three of the bishops, Benedick Miller, Jacob Oesch, and Christian Yoder, Sr., made the journey to Ohio. There once more a conference was appointed and the matter was discussed again. This conference was written up as follows by an Ohio bishop named Hannes Yoder:

Wayne County, Ohio, May 25, 1831

A conference of the ministers in the state of Pennsylvania and the state of Ohio in regard to baptism between our confession of faith and that of the Mennonites whether they can be received among us without baptism. As it was clearly shown and recognized on the authority of the Holy Scriptures how ministers must be chosen and called in the church of the Lord and must be ordained and consecrated to all services and duties in the name of the Lord, and that it is not fitting that the ordinances of the Holy Trinity should be administered in the church of the Lord by a stranger who is spotted with a single spot of unsound faith, and that it is just as unbecoming for him to officiate at the ordinance of baptism as at the ordinance of communion or the greeting of the brotherly kiss and peace [spoken by the bishop to an applicant at the conclusion of baptism or on the restoration of a fallen member?], therefore, we declare that all ministers, who are outside of this order and have not been called and chosen thereto by our church, cannot exercise any Gospel service in our church; therefore, the baptism of strangers cannot be recognized among us as complete [or perfect]. For because it is acknowledged among us on the authority of the Holy Scriptures that their profession of faith is imperfect, therefore, we do not recognize them as perfect brethren in the communion. For as the communion service is sacred on account of true and perfect faith so also baptism is sacred on account of faith and, therefore, the baptism is no better than the faith. Therefore, such an admission to membership without [our] baptism cannot be considered perfect [or

complete]. Then for these reasons it was decided in response to the demand of the ministers in the state of Ohio, of Hannes Miller near Canton, Moses Beechy (Pitsche), Jacob Miller and David Zook, all bishops, that if they are asked to officiate (*wann ihnen der Platz gegeben wird*) when Mennonites wish to unite with us and they would find it difficult [on account of conscientious scruples] to baptize them, then they were to be given permission to send them to those who could do it without burdening their conscience. Then the other bishops agreed to this demand and accepted both their demand and their offer as follows: If anyone [an Amish bishop] was asked to officiate [when a Mennonite applied for membership in an Amish congregation] and if he found it difficult to baptize them himself, he was not to be compelled to do so, but he might turn them over to those who could do it [i.e., rebaptize them] without burdening their conscience, and, therefore, not burden his own conscience. On the other hand, they promised not to receive into membership any [Mennonites] without [re-] baptism. Following this promise on both sides this resolution of peace was confirmed and concluded as a vow before God and publicly before the congregation. The conference closed with thanks to God and with prayer. And following this resolution of peace the brethren and sisters requested the ministers from Pennsylvania not to return home until they had confirmed this peace resolution with an act [of peace] and had broken bread [observed communion] with them. This they accepted, and did then take leave of the congregation and commended all peace-hearted brethren and sisters to God. To this we bear witness who ourselves were present

Hannes Yoder, Ohio
Hannes Fordenwald
Christian Kinig
Jacob Esch, Pennsylvania
Christian Yoder, Sr. (*der alte*)

Lancaster County, April 20, 1864[27]

Articles [of Agreement] of the [Amish] ministers conference of the ministers of the various congregations in Upper and Lower Millcreek, Conestoga, Maryland, Toscarara [Tuscarawas County, Ohio?], the Upper and Lower Kishacoquilas congregations and Buffalo Valley. We, the undersigned, have agreed as follows, namely, we will allow Salomon Beiler and his fellow ministers to administer baptism in the water but David Beiler and his fellow ministers[28] [and] Abraham Pitsche and his fellow ministers[29] do not wish the baptism in the water. We agree further about Samuel Yoder's ministry as deacon that it shall be as our fathers had it.[30] We agree further that we hold or consider education [*die Hochgelehrsamkeit*], Sunday schools, showy clothes, fancy vehicles, and so on as harmful. We agree further in answer to Salomon Beiler's question whether Samuel Yoder may be ordained bishop with the counsel of the Church if the congregation gives the counsel

[27] This was a conference held independently of the annual conference of Amish ministers. The 1864 Amish general conference was held near Goshen, Indiana, on June 16, 17, and 18, 1864.

[28] Of Bird-in-Hand, Lancaster County.

[29] Of Mifflin County.

[30] The question of participation in the church service by the deacon was a controversial issue in several Amish conferences following 1862. His charge as deacon required him to read the Scripture at the opening of the church service, but did not include the privilege of speaking at the opening of the service, or of preaching.

to it which would be answered with, "Yes."[31] Further we decided to submit our decisions to our congregations and to take the counsel [vote] of the congregations whether they agree with these decisions and if they agree, then it shall be considered as a conclusion of peace.[32]

N.B. In regard to the ban (Meidung) we accept it as Christ and the apostles instituted it.[33]

[31] Samuel Yoder, a deacon, was ordained bishop in the summer of this same year (1864) and soon became one of the outstanding leaders in the Amish Mennonite group. A deacon on being ordained bishop was commissioned, in addition to reading the Scriptures, to open the service with admonition and prayer or even to preach when called upon. See THE MENNONITE QUARTERLY REVIEW (October, 1939), 237, 247, and 248.

[32] Although this seems a concession to lay opinion, it may have been intended primarily to guarantee unity and uniformity by insuring that all the ministers who attended the conference would teach their congregations, using the convincing arguments which had led to a unanimous vote among the ministry and which thus would assure an affirmative vote in each congregation. Evidence shows, however, that Bishop David Beiler was not a dictator, but that he counseled with his congregation on matters of policy and discipline.

[33] Unfortunately the signatures are lacking. Internal evidence indicates that the following were among those present: Bishop Salomon Beiler, Bishop David Beiler, Bishop Abraham Peachy, and Deacon Samuel Yoder. Christian King from Buffalo Valley probably also was present. The latter soon lost interest in the general conferences. For a few brief bits of characterization of Christian King, see THE MENNONITE QUARTERLY REVIEW, VI (April, 1933), 71, 74, 78, 89; also VI (July, 1933), 172, 173, 175.

ANABAPTIST HISTORIOGRAPHY IN THE SCHOLARSHIP OF TODAY

DONOVAN E. SMUCKER

Today Reformation research is gaining momentum everywhere. Hence, it is significant when a leading Protestant historian, Wilhelm Pauck, quotes a distinguished Catholic historian, C. J. H. Hayes, as follows: "In the long run the radical sects proved to be more characteristic of Protestantism than Henry VIII, or Calvin or even a Luther. And however transitory the tenets and practices of particular radical sects may have been, there can be no doubt that it was the succession of such sects which conferred upon Protestant Christendom the distinction of substituting individualist for collective Christianity. This was really a revolutionary attitude toward Christianity."[1] Few church historians of our day would argue with the basic thesis of this statement. This is especially true from the perspective of American church history where sectarianism has won a sweeping and decisive victory though, to be sure, sectarianism itself has been modified in this process. If time and space permitted one might well reject the undue emphasis on individualism as the real fruit of the Reformation. Certainly this was not the intention of Luther's doctrine of Christian liberty; or, for that matter, of the Anabaptists themselves. While the latter approach is in constant peril of an exaggerated individualism, its intention is not really this since it has always had a radical doctrine of discipline (always the foe of individualism) and the Christian brotherhood as the real unit of Christian life. The inner life of the true heirs of Anabaptism has always emphasized a strong co-operative group life. To the outsider the frequent divisions under conditions of total religious liberty tend to refute this inner corporateness. Paradoxically, these many schisms in Anabaptist-Mennonite groups are due primarily to the intense group feeling as it comes into conflict with the individualism of its members. Perhaps it is just this tension in sectarian groups which is never resolved.

Be that as it may, no less a historian than Kenneth Scott Latourette has written that "Protestantism is becoming more weighted on the left wing radical phases of the movement."[2] This thesis was elaborated in Dr. Latourette's presidential address to the American Society of Church History in January, 1946. It is

[1] *Church History*, Dec., 1940, pp. 335-356.
[2] *Church History*, March, 1946, p. 12.

predicated on the assumption that American church life is basically radical; that the American nation as a whole will exert tremendous influence in the whole era ahead. *Ipso facto,* left wing Protestantism will now have more world outreach than any time previously in its history. (European Protestants, especially on the Continent, are disturbed just because this is true. "Low" Protestantism of this type is quite distasteful to them. On the other hand, interpreters like A. L. Warnshuis have been reporting a new synthesis of faith and life in Europe which provides some hope for a genuine *rapprochement.*)[3] In any case, the issues posed by the Anabaptists are confronting the issues posed by the Lutherans and the Calvinists. In that meeting may yet come a strong synthesis of Christianity in this time of trial. Speaking quite subjectively, this writer is convinced that all three traditions need one another.

THE SITUATION REGARDING RESEARCH

"The rapid increase of research in their [Anabaptist] history is to be explained," writes Wilhelm Pauck, "by the fact that the scholars have recognized as their duty to fill out the picture of the beginnings of Protestantism which was left incomplete by the neglect of the evangelical radicals on the part of the former historians. Furthermore, the modern descendants of the sectarians have begun to make scholarly contributions to their history. The knowledge of Anabaptist history, which because of the nature of the sources and because of their inaccessibility is difficult to obtain, will complete the picture of the inner and outer history of the Reformation."[5] In the light of this declaration let us list some of the reasons for the inadequate attention up to this point to Anabaptist research.

1. The popular myth that all the Anabaptists were fanatical heretics or meaningless quietists resulted either in scorn or neglect. The widely used text by Professor Lars Qualben, *A History of the Christian Church,* tends to perpetuate both of these half-truths. While admitting the diversity of Anabaptists, he insists that all groups spiritualized the outer Word of God. This was not at all true of the major group of soundly Biblical Anabaptists. As a

[3] Dr. Warnshuis first called my attention to *The Struggle of the Dutch Church for the Maintenance of the Commandments of God in the Life of the State,* edited by W. A. Visser 't Hooft. Sometimes called the Dutch Book of Acts.

[4] I always use the term "Calvinism" somewhat reluctantly. First it ignores Zwingli; second it personalizes a movement whose most characteristic statement, the Westminster Confession, was a corporate expression. Nevertheless, Calvinism is a standard term.

[5] *Church History,* Dec., 1940, p. 336.

matter of fact, the literalism of this main group has often brought against it the charge of bibliolatry. These main line Anabaptists have been at one with the larger Reformation on the issue of Scripture.

It is truly amazing to hear American Protestants summarize the basic issues of the Reformation exclusively in terms of Luther and Calvin without even so much as a hint at the tremendous impact which the Anabaptists exerted in the Christian fellowship. The utter break with the state church, the emphasis upon freedom, a radical Biblicism, all these are fruits of the Anabaptist Reformation. While they may not be accepted as normative, they must not be ignored in their true historical genesis in the Anabaptists and their pre-Reformation forerunners. Perhaps no scholar has sketched in this role of the Anabaptists more effectively than Ernst Troeltsch. Others, however, have also supported this view.

2. The neglect of the Anabaptists may also be explained by the early extermination of the Swiss Brethren leadership, thus limiting the literary expression of the most important early Anabaptists. Rufus M. Jones has been frequently quoted to the effect that "It can be safely said that no other movement for spiritual freedom in the history of the church has such an enormous martyrology . . . ."[6] Only Pilgram Marpeck of the Swiss Brethren left a literary record of the early Swiss Anabaptist outlook. This material is even yet not translated into English, and is not comprehensive. Harold S. Bender of Goshen College has a book now in press on *Conrad Grebel, 1498-1526, Founder of the Swiss Brethren*[7] which should fill in some of these gaps. But it takes many years before original historical research trickles down into the more conventional channels of scholarship which must, of necessity, live on these secondary sources. In any case, neither the limited sources nor the ignorance of the sources, however limited, must permit contemporary historians to ignore the great interaction between Zwingli and his left-wing opponents. Zwingli did not ignore them; Luther did not ignore them (count the references to the Anabaptists in his commentary on Galatians); Calvin did not ignore them.

3. The fact that much Anabaptist material is in the Dutch language also helps to explain the lack of Anabaptist research. The comprehensive historiography of the Mennonites in the Netherlands by Cornelius Krahn has been published both in *Church History* (September, 1944) and in THE MENNONITE QUARTERLY REVIEW

[6] *Studies in Mystical Religion*, pp. 392-393.

[7] The Mennonite Historical Society, Goshen, Indiana.

(October, 1944). It lists almost one hundred titles which would shed a great deal of light on Anabaptism in the Low Countries and Germany; and, in any case, it presents the only complete corpus of authoritative literature for Dutch Anabaptist research.

The mastery of languages among American scholars has much to be desired. Even the traditional Ph.D. examinations in French and German are often not taken very seriously as real tools of research. But, even assuming a mastery of German, there is the additional barrier of the Dutch language for those who would seriously labor in this field. While the transition from German to Dutch is not great, nevertheless it is a transition which entails special lingual preparation. And, what is more important, while serious American scholarship has followed developments in the German and Swiss theological faculties, Dutch writings have caused very little stir here except among the Dutch Reformed people who follow men like Kuyper and Bavinck. One of the pioneer attempts to work in this literature was done by Henry Elias Dosker who in 1918-1919 delivered the Stone Lectures at Princeton which were subsequently published under the title, *The Dutch Anabaptists* (Judson, 1921). This book has too many limitations, however, to be the authoritative statement in this long neglected field.

4. Research by the American Mennonite heirs of the Anabaptists was limited from the start by prejudice against higher education, a prejudice now giving way to vigorous scholarly studies in this field. It is not true to say that American Mennonites never published any materials until recent years. This is clearly refuted in Harold S. Bender's *Two Centuries of American Mennonite Literature, 1727-1927*. Yet not until about fifty years ago did any serious historical works appear in this field apart from the reprinting of such works as the *Martyrs' Mirror,* the most widely used early work of this group (1660). C. Henry Smith of Bluffton College and John Horsch of Scottdale, Pennsylvania, pioneered in this field. Horsch's periodical literature began as early as 1887 and his *Kurzegefasste Geschichte der Mennoniten-Gemeinden* was published in 1890. Smith's *Mennonites in America* was published in 1909. But Smith's first book on both the European and American background was not published until 1920 under the title, *The Mennonites*. Horsch's very original historical study of infant baptism was published in 1917, his book on the Hutterites in 1931, and his most enduring work, *Mennonites in Europe,* was published posthumously in 1942. Incidentally, Horsch entered into the Modernist-Fundamentalist controversy of the twenties and thirties with great

vigor, writing a book *Modern Religious Liberalism* which became something of a textbook in Fundamentalist circles, but which is devoid of distinctively Anabaptist affirmations except the emphasis on Scripture as the Word of God.

Moreover, the books of these Mennonite scholars have been published apart from the main stream of American religious books. One glance at the basic works by Quaker historians and theologians will reveal that their books have been sold by Macmillan, Harper, and other leading publishers. On the other hand, a number of Mennonite historical works of real merit have been limited in their use because of careless, unprofessional techniques. The conspicuous exception to all these criticisms is THE MENNONITE QUARTERLY REVIEW.

The foregoing analysis has not discussed the contribution of other heirs of the Anabaptist movement who have lived in this country.[8] Time does not permit a discussion of the American Baptists whose influence here has been great. A. H. Newman wrote his *A History of Anti-Pedobaptism* in 1902, showing the continuity of believer's baptism in various Protestant groups. But on the whole American Baptists have been too much concerned with the issue of baptism, as such, and have cut themselves loose from the more radical ethical center of early Anabaptist thought, following the Hubmaier approach. The average Baptist is really a very conventional Christian despite the elaborate apparatus of exclusivism which is thrown up around the church. This conventional Baptist is just as horrified with the ethical radicalism of the real Anabaptists as is any other conventional denominationalist. But, the tenacity of Baptist conviction, the quest for freedom, and the rugged individualism, in the context of group discipline—all this is fruit from Grebel, and his associates of Zurich, 1525. It is perhaps significant that many of America's most militant Modernists and Fundamentalists have come from Baptist circles.

In any case, it is clear that the golden age of Anabaptist research is slowly but surely arriving. A number of effectively trained scholars are now in touch with the original sources. Three volumes of the *Quellen zur Geschichte der Wiedertaüfer* (Leipzig, 1930 ff) have been published by the Verein für Reformationsgeschichte. American Mennonite scholars have definite plans to translate and re-edit the *Mennonitisches Lexikon* which has been gathering up the fruits of scholarly labors in Germany under Christian Hege

[8] The writings of the late President C. H. Wedel of Bethel College deserve serious inquiry and wider circulation. These essays are in German and remain virtually unknown. They were written from 1890 to 1911.

and Christian Neff. Undoubtedly the use of this material by English-reading scholars will in the near future correct many distortions and fill in many gaps in Reformation history.

DEFINITION OF THE VARIOUS ANABAPTIST GROUPS

One of the results of the studies up to this point has been the delineation of the various movements classified under the heading of Anabaptists. Qualben is certainly right in recognizing this fact and thus declaring that "Anabaptism was the collective name of a wide variety of religious opinions held by various groups." Reference has already been made to the older tendency to dismiss the whole movement by crying, "Muenster," signifying thereby an unholy trilogy of heresy, carnality, and anarchy. C. Henry Smith in his *The Story of the Mennonites* quite properly accepts the classification of Newman as the most useful. This, he says, is in the spirit of the early Zwinglians themselves whose historian Heinrich Bullinger recognized thirteen different groups as early as 1560. The classification from Newman's *A Manual of Church History* is as follows:

1. Chiliastic Anabaptists.[9] This includes the Melchiorites and the Muensterites.

2. The soundly Biblical Anabaptists. This group includes the Swiss Brethren and their followers in South Germany, the Moravian Hutterites, and the Mennonites. These are the only modern groups with direct survival in our day.

3. The pantheistic Anabaptists. Here he includes David Joris whose life has been so carefully studied by Roland H. Bainton.

4. The mystical Anabaptists. The main representatives here are Hans Denck and Ludwig Hetzer. While Hans Denck was a noble and winsome Christian, it is significant that Newman does not include him with the soundly Biblical group because of his rejection of the outer authority of the Bible as the Word of God. Mennonite liberals usually hold up Denck as their ideal.

5. The Antitrinitarian Anabaptists. The new book by Earl Morse Wilbur, *A History of Unitarianism: Socinianism and Its Antecedents,*[10] makes much, perhaps too much, of this wing of Ana-

[9] In Shirley Jackson Case's *Millennial Hope,* a history of this conviction, he argues that premillennialism was brought into circulation by the Chiliastic Anabaptists after its virtual extinction by Augustine 600 years before. He failed to add that after Muenster premillennialism disappears among the followers of Menno with amillennialism becoming the basic position.

[10] Harvard University Press, 1945.

baptism and particularly of the success of Socinian Unitarians among the later Dutch Mennonites.

THEORIES OF ORIGIN OF THE ANABAPTISTS

Robert Friedmann's article, "Conception of the Anabaptists,"[11] is the most helpful single source at this point. In shorter form the same research may be found in H. S. Bender's "Anabaptist Vision."[12] From this background one finds ten different theories on the origin of the Anabaptists as follows:

1. They were the forerunners of modern socialism, or the culminating effort of medieval communism. Kautsky is the name most commonly associated with this view though any Marxist historian would share the position which seeks to find class realities behind all movements.

2. Anabaptism was a movement of socio-religious emancipation for the oppressed peasants and other disenfranchised groups. This was the view of Balfort Bax in his *Rise and Fall of the Anabaptists,* reaffirmed by H. Richard Niebuhr in *The Social Sources of Denominationalism.* In the case of both theories, the acceptance of them is based on two factors: first, the philosophy of history which is held.[13] Kautsky's argument, along with Niebuhr's, tends to rise or fall on the acceptance or rejection of some kind of economic determinism as the pivot of history. In Christian thought economic determinism is not accepted; hence the theories break down at the very start. But, the second question is one of historical relationships. It is indeed true that the early Anabaptists did appeal to those people, oppressed and overburdened, who wanted a genuine life of brotherhood rather than a political church; who also wanted a protest against the luxury and wealth of the established churches; and, who discovered as students a Biblical critique of wealth and money.[14] Having said this, however, it is quite false to view the Anabaptists as the forerunners of modern social-

[11] *Church History,* Dec., 1940. The same issue which contains Wilhelm Pauck's valuable historiography of the German Reformation.

[12] *Church History,* March, 1944, and MENNONITE QUARTERLY REVIEW, April, 1944.

[13] It is significant that in recent years H. Richard Niebuhr has seriously revised his earlier environmentalist approach. See his *The Kingdom of God in America* (Chicago, 1937.

[14] In John Horsch's *The Hutterian Brethren* he deals with Niebuhr's thesis in *Social Sources of Denominationalism.* I think, however, that he misses Niebuhr's point since he mainly tries to show that it was economically unprofitable to become a persecuted Anabaptist. An oppressed person always assumes that the path to glory will be sacrificial. One thing is certain: the early Anabaptist leaders were not uncultured poor men whatever the main following may have been socially and economically.

ism. The simple Biblical world of the Anabaptists is in radical opposition to the Hegelian dialectical materialism of Karl Marx and the other socialists. Any attempt to bridge these two is historical fantasy.

3. The Anabaptists are a continuation of the third order of St. Francis. Albrecht Ritschl argues this in his *Geschichte des Pietismus,* including the seventeenth century Pietistic groups as well. Here is a worldly monasticism: restitution of the early form of Christianity by renouncing the world, personal purity, poverty and expectation of the kingdom of God. All this, in the third order of St. Francis, was for family units who could not take the traditional celibate vows. Douglas Steere of the Society of Friends has been quite impressed with these *Tertiarii.* Here and there a Mennonite writer notes a similar parallel.[15] While extremely suggestive and granting that forerunners of the Reformation tend to be overlooked, the theory has never received any decisive establishment as a conscious influence of the Anabaptists. To be established at all, it must exist as an indirect and unconscious influence. If the theory is sound, however, it is to the glory of the Anabaptists.

4. The Anabaptists form a link in the chain of sectarian Christians beginning with the Waldenses, Bogomili, Cathari, Paulicians, Donatists, and the Apostolic Church itself. Ludwig Keller particularly emphasized the role of the Waldensians in relation to the Anabaptists; the Baptist historians are fond of developing the whole series of links in the chain back to the apostles. Broadbent's book, *The Pilgrim Church,*[16] attempts to trace this "righteous remnant" through church history. The following quotation from the jacket of the book reveals this emphasis quite clearly. "Those who have taken any interest in church history will know that, from the first days when the professing church was invaded by worldly principles, and when powers of earth began to employ ecclesiastical institutions to subserve political ends, there have been, in larger or smaller numbers, bodies of believers who, in the faith of Christ, have chosen to stand apart, unwilling to confound spiritual things with interests of a worldly order. By whatsoever name they were known, these people have been described, and their distinctive witness unfolded in the remarkable work compiled by Broadbent, who shows the fundamental difference between Christian believers and adherents of corrupt churches, ancient and modern, East and

[15] The late Edward Yoder in *Proceedings of the Second Annual Conference on Mennonite Cultural Problems,* p. 109.

[16] E. H. Broadbent, *The Pilgrim Church* (Pickering & Inglis, London, 1945).

West." Significantly enough, the Anabaptists receive fifty-five pages of treatment in this church history which emphasizes the dissenting sects as the main bodies of Christendom. This is not written from a liberal viewpoint, but from that of a conservative Biblical Protestantism. Yet this book itself fails to establish any clear or organic connection among these various groups. They are pictured more as cropping up spontaneously through Bible study and the work of the Holy Spirit. Any attempt to establish a conscious organic relation among these groups and the Anabaptists must fail for want of adequate proof.

5. The Anabaptists all had a decidedly mystical strain and in Hans Denck they had one of the greatest Christian mystics of all time. This is the view of Rufus M. Jones who says: "Hubmaier was more distinctly evangelical than Denck who was the great mystic of the group, and yet there was a decidedly mystical strain in Hubmaier, as there was furthermore, in the entire Anabaptist movement."[17] The tribute to Denck is very moving in the hands of Jones; and there can be no doubt concerning the saintliness and spiritual qualities of Hans Denck. Yet, as was pointed out previously, Denck's spiritualizing of Scripture is not in the main stream of the Anabaptist tradition. Moreover, one must not interpret the radical criticism of liturgy as mysticism. The Quakers may argue that they took this tendency to its logical conclusion; but in any case the Biblical Anabaptists did not so interpret their attack on ritual and liturgy. That Anabaptism influenced, if not actually determined many characteristics of Quakerism seems beyond denial.

6. The Anabaptists were the heirs of Erasmus. Walter Koehler has popularized this view, and Smithson in his work, *The Anabaptists,* also finds some basis for it. He declares that "many of the Anabaptist leaders had been disciples of Erasmus before advancing beyond his ideas of reform and becoming champions of a more radical Reformation."[18] Yet once again there is no decisive evidence for this theory, even if Erasmus did influence some of the Anabaptists.

7. The Anabaptists laid the foundation of modern civilization by attacking and eventually destroying the *Corpus Christianum,* the church civilization. This is the view of Ernst Troeltsch. One must hasten to add that in this theory the basic reality is the social forces of the modern world. And, moreover, in bringing to light

[17] Jones, *op. cit.,* p. 387.
[18] R. J. Smithson, *The Anabaptists,* p. 31.

voluntarism, freedom and scholarship, the Anabaptists were aided in later years by Arminians, Socinians, mystics, and humanists. But the major momentum, the first momentum, came from the Anabaptists with their conception of sect, i.e., a highly disciplined select group, as over against the "church," the religious aspect of the community as a whole. Moreover, Troeltsch also argues that early Protestantism was merely a modification of Catholicism and that under the pressure of the Anabaptists later Protestantism took up the essentials of the free-church system, thus profoundly altering the view of the Reformers. *The Social Teaching of the Christian Churches* and the shorter *Protestantism and Progress* are real landmarks in Reformation research.

If Christianity is to be thought of primarily in terms of social ethics, the analysis of Troeltsch remains extraordinarily suggestive despite radical attacks from men like Karl Holl. Since Troeltsch was seeking to further modern religious liberalism, and was committed to a rather radical environmentalism, his viewpoint must be read with an eye to his prejudice against a more revelational theology. The Reformation cannot be interpreted in essentially liberal sociological categories, even though strictly social forces may be so interpreted. The Anabaptists themselves certainly never thought of their movement apart from profoundly evangelical impulses. If they contributed to modern civilization, well and good. But, this was not their basic intention, nor was it their belief that, in the long run, this is the most crucial aspect of a Christian movement. Nevertheless, the great scholarship of Troeltsch has restored some radically neglected truths.

8. Anabaptism had its origin in a rediscovery of the apocalyptic theology of martyrdom. This is the thesis of Professor Ethelbert Stauffer of Bonn, published in the *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* in 1933 and translated and republished in THE MENNONITE QUARTERLY REVIEW: "Martyrdom is in truth a reflex of the cosmic battle between God and anti-God, and the victory of the martyr forecasts the final victory of the spiritual powers. Thus martyrdom is both a causal and a teleological necessity."[19] Professor Stauffer finds very clear evidences of this in the early Luther. Upon hearing of the death of two Augustinian monks he declares: "I thought I myself should be the very first one who should be martyred for the sake of the Holy Gospel; but apparently I was not worthy of that."[20] Gradually, however, according to Stauffer's

[19] THE MENNONITE QUARTERLY REVIEW, July, 1945, p. 180.
[20] *Ibid.*, p. 183.

argument, Luther abandoned this conviction. The thread is picked up from this point and Professor Stauffer marshals much convincing evidence for martyrdom as the basic theme of the Anabaptist reading of Scripture, of the Christian life, as typological of Christ's death on the cross and as eschatologically suggestive. At the conclusion of his brilliant essay the Bonn professor writes: "The Anabaptists paid for their peace testimony with increased persecutions. They accepted them and by that testified that the peace of the Kingdom of Christ has no abode on earth in this aeon. Conflict is the main feature of this aeon, and the path of discipleship of Christ remains for the entire span between Calvary and the end a way of martyrdom."[21]

In criticizing this approach the editor of THE MENNONITE QUARTERLY REVIEW suggests that the content of this struggle of the martyr is not clearly set forth. It does present the mood of the Anabaptists, but not the theme. It does not indicate the peculiar role of persecution in influencing a theology of this kind. But, there is certainly a very strong case to be made for this as the basic mood of the early Anabaptists with much Scripture and church history to support the mood with authority. Robert Friedmann tends to support this approach of Stauffer, emphasizing the Anabaptist union of love and the cross in *Nachfolge*.

9. "Anabaptism is the culmination of the Reformation, the fulfillment of the original vision of Luther and Zwingli and thus . . . a consistent evangelical Protestantism seeking to recreate without compromise the original New Testament church, the vision of Christ and the apostles."[22] Among the advocates of this viewpoint are Max Göbel, C. A. Cornelius, Johann Loserth, Karl Rembert, Ernst Correll, John Horsch, Fritz Blanke, and Harold S. Bender (in his presidential address to the American Society of Church History, 1943). There is no question that the earliest vision of the main Reformers was surrounded with a crusading zeal, a moral intensity, a simple Biblical ideal which was later lost in the vicissitudes of the state church. But, the violent reaction of the Roman church in league with the armed state, frightened Luther and Zwingli into a more loosely organized church as the price for political support. Moreover, the criticisms of the Anabaptists led to a kind of dead end which did not register at the political banks of exchange; for the Anabaptists rejected all political responsibility. Theirs, in effect, was a theocracy within the secular political order.

[21] *Ibid.*, p. 214.

[22] H. S. Bender, MENNONITE QUARTERLY REVIEW, XVIII (April, 1944), 74.

For this reason it does not seem possible to argue that Anabaptism fulfilled the original vision of Luther and Zwingli. That original vision called for a more radical moral purgation of the church; for a simpler return to Biblical authority. But, as Troeltsch has so effectively argued, Luther and Zwingli never rejected some kind of *Corpus Christianum*. Troeltsch would say that the Anabaptists eventually forced a qualitative change in the outlook of main stream Protestantism on the issues of church and state, freedom of conscience and voluntarism in general. Yet, it is still possible (once that early vision is more carefully defined) to see the Anabaptists as carrying the more radical early program of the Reformation. The state church with all its relativities could not possibly have satisfied the Christian heart which caught the vision of Luther at Wittenberg boldly defying a corrupt church.

10. Anabaptism is the religion of the "Schwärmer," a perversion of everything basic, arising where all heresy arises, in Satanic unbelief. This view of Luther, Zwingli, and Calvin needs no further elaboration. No doubt this is (or was) the most common evaluation of the Anabaptists. The perspective of history has shown many of the enduring contributions of the Anabaptists. It has indicated the soundly Biblical group which has survived until this day. It is indeed true that a certain radicalism has always been operative among the Anabaptists. Hence, the charge was not wholly without foundation. That it should have led to barbaric persecution in what Richard Niebuhr calls the "Protestant Inquisition" is nothing short of tragic.

Thus we have concluded our survey of theories of origins. This should enrich our appreciation of the Anabaptists while shedding further light on the complexities and risks of radical Protestantism. Meanwhile, all research in this field must be based on the direct testimony of the Anabaptists themselves in order to avoid that kind of historiography which formulates a theory and then reads back into history this pre-judgment. Kautsky's concept is perhaps exhibit A at this point. There is just enough truth in his argument to give it some plausibility. Yet, such distortions must be dismissed and rejected.

TOPICS FOR RESEARCH IN MENNONITE HISTORY AND LIFE

J. Winfield Fretz and Melvin Gingerich

In recent years interest in Mennonite history and life has not only increased considerably among Mennonites, but non-Mennonite scholars have also paid more attention to this segment of Protestantism than previously. More Mennonites are now attending institutions of higher learning than in any previous period of the denomination's history. Term paper assignments in English, history, sociology and other studies often call for topics from the student's experience. Thus our Mennonite students are constantly asking for significant topics that can be used for research projects in their college classes.

Students in graduate schools and seminaries are also asking for thesis subjects in this field of study. Within the last decade several doctor's dissertations in American universities have been devoted to Anabaptism and Mennonitism. In addition an increasing number of magazine writers and authors of popular books have been using topics from Mennonite history and life for their themes.

The list of topics below is not exhaustive but it is designed to serve as a guide into the chief areas of research. Several years ago the writers sent a questionnaire to a selected group of Mennonite scholars, asking them to suggest topics for research in Mennonite history and life. The suggestions were compiled and edited by the writers and topics were added by them. The list, therefore, is the result of the thinking of nearly a dozen Mennonite scholars.

It should be pointed out that the topics given are primarily in the field of American Mennonitism. Only as comparisons are made between the European and American scenes, or as the European background becomes a major factor in the interpretation of developments in the New World are references made to European Mennonitism. This article, therefore, should be followed shortly by one listing topics for research in European Mennonitism.

The arrangement of subjects under subdivisions is somewhat arbitrary. Several subjects placed under "History," for example, might well be under "Sociological Problems" or "Economic Problems." The reverse is also true. A casual examination reveals that they are not of equal weight. Many could well be used as subjects for doctor's dissertations. Others would serve excellently as topics for master's theses, while a few might be handled satisfactorily in college themes or research papers.

History

1. The cultural and social history of the Pennsylvania German Mennonites and Amish of the eighteenth century and the first half of the nineteenth century.
2. The crisis of Mennonites in the cities.
3. The history of Mennonite attitudes toward temperance.
4. The influence of the American frontier upon Mennonitism.
5. A collection of Amish sermons.
6. The history of Mennonite relief in the Near East in World War I.
7. The influence of Mennonites in local government.
8. The effect of political life on the ideals and principles of Mennonites who accept public office.
9. Mennonites and social reform.
10. Mennonites and community relations in World Wars I and II.
11. The peace record of the Mennonite Church during the Civil War.
12. The part the Mennonites played in the Pennsylvania-German influence upon America.
13. A history of the westward movement of the Mennonites.
14. A study of the railroad records dealing with the Russian Mennonite immigration.
15. Factors causing Mennonite migration to America from 1800 to 1850.
16. Kansas Mennonites and wheat.
17. The relation of land agents to Mennonite settlements as factors determining the consequent success or failure of established communities.
18. Mennonitism in the face of collectivism.
19. Area histories of Mennonite settlements and churches:
    a. Maryland.
    b. Western Canada.
    c. Missouri.
    d. Oklahoma.
    e. Texas and the Deep South.
    f. California.
    g. Michigan.
    h. Minnesota, the Dakotas, Montana, and Idaho.
    i. Virginia.
    j. Ohio.
    k. New York.
    l. Indiana

Religious Problems

1. Developments in worship, creeds, piety, songbooks and musical instruments, religious instruction and preaching.
2. The growth of premillennialism in the Mennonite Church.
3. Influence of Pietism (eighteenth century and ff.) upon Mennonites.
4. Interchange of influence between Dunkers and Mennonites.
5. The modern tabernacle movement and the Mennonites.
6. The growth of Sunday-school libraries.
7. The history and use of the Catechism in the Mennonite Church.
8. Mennonitism and Modernism.
9. The role of the minister in a Mennonite community.
10. Mennonite modes of worship, past and present.
11. A study of Mennonite piety, causes and effects.
12. Symbolism in the Mennonite Church.
13. The past and present methods of training Mennonite ministers and the place of a seminary in the Mennonite Church.
14. Mennonite techniques and methods in evangelism.
15. A statement and a critical evaluation of the Mennonite doctrine of church and state relationships in democratic countries.

16. Influence of the radio on Mennonite thought and life.
17. A critique of Mennonites.
18. The attitude toward voting among Mennonites.
19. Kansas C.O.'s in World War I and II.
20. Ft. Leavenworth and the C.O.'s in World War I.
21. The history of Mennonite missions among the American Indians.
22. A comparison of Amish Mennonite sermons with those of other church groups.
23. The history and use of prayer books in Amish and Mennonite services.

Educational Problems

1. The influence of non-Mennonite Bible Schools upon the Mennonites.
2. The history of Goshen College.
3. Mennonite Christian day schools.
4. Education among the Pennsylvania German Mennonites during the eighteenth century.
5. Education among the conservative Mennonites of Manitoba, Mexico, and Paraguay (Old Colony).
6. The influence of higher education on Mennonites.
7. The influence of public schools on Mennonite beliefs and practices.
8. An analysis of the content of Mennonite Bible School training courses.
9. What Mennonite schools and colleges are doing to preserve Mennonite traditions.
10. Non-Mennonite literature that has influenced Mennonites.
11. The educational program of Mennonite Civilian Public Service.

Sociological Problems

1. Instruments of social control used by the church to protect itself from "the world."
2. Burial customs and the simple life among the Mennonites.
3. The background of existing divisions among American Mennonites.
   a. Different European backgrounds.
   b. Individualism as expressed in piety and church organization.
4. The influence of urbanization.
5. A study of Mennonites from point of view of C. H. Cooley's theory of the primary group.
6. Accommodation, assimilation, and acculturation processes in specific Mennonite communities.
7. A study of specific Mennonite communities as to patterns of community life.
8. The fellowship between Mennonite immigrants of various migrations. (A socio-psychological problem.)
9. The influence of wealth upon Mennonites. (A socio-economic problem.)
10. Mennonite and Amish social life.
11. Mennonite folk-tales.
12. A study of delinquency and crime rates and patterns in Mennonite communities.
13. The effect of urban influences on Mennonite rural life.
14. The social behavior of Mennonites in time of group persecution.
15. Characteristics of Mennonite life that make them a distinctive cultural group.
16. Mennonite attitudes toward other races.
17. Case studies of successful and unsuccessful Mennonite colonies.

18. A comparison of eighteenth and nineteenth century Mennonite immigrants.
19. The "genius" of the Mennonites.

Economic Problems

1. Mutual aid and co-operatives among the Mennonites.
2. The economic life and contributions of the Mennonites in Kansas (wheat), Manitoba, Ontario, British Columbia, Brazil, Mexico, etc.
3. The silk industry among Kansas Mennonites.
4. The beginning of Mennonite flour mills.
5. The general influences of the capitalistic system on the Mennonite way of life.
6. Have Mennonite boys pursued agricultural courses in colleges and universities?
7. The contribution of Mennonites to farming in America.
8. Mennonites and money-lending.
9. The influence of Civilian Public Service upon the campers' selection of occupations.
10. Mennonites and tobacco farming.
11. The shift of American Mennonites from agriculture to business and the professions.

Cultural Problems

1. The attitude of Mennonites toward accepting government relief and subsidy payments.
2. Social practices in early American Mennonite communities.
3. Mennonite and Amish marriage practices.
4. The social significance of language in preserving Mennonite culture.
5. Social and cultural distinctions and similarities of contemporary Mennonite bodies.
6. Cultural backgrounds accounting for American Mennonite differences.
7. Differing European backgrounds as causes of congregational discord.
8. A cultural comparison of European Mennonitism with American Mennonitism.

Literature and Music

1. The Mennonite attitude toward art.
2. A history of Mennonite music.
3. Household arts in Mennonite communities.
4. A survey of Mennonite religious journalism.
   a. A list of publications past and present.
   b. Dates of founding and extinction.
   c. Types of content.
   d. Changing emphasis.
5. A history of the way Mennonites have been interpreted in the secular American press.
6. Survey of Mennonite hymnals used during four centuries of worship.
7. Mennonites in American drama.
8. The Mennonites as portrayed in contemporary literature.

Biography

1. John F. Funk.
2. J. S. Coffman.
3. J. M. Brenneman.
4. C. Z. Yoder.
5. J. S. Shoemaker.
6. M. S. Steiner.
7. John H. Oberholtzer.
8. C. H. Wedel.
9. Bernhard Warkentin.
10. David Goertz.

A CHAPTER FROM ALTERNATIVE SERVICE IN RUSSIA

Johann P. Bueckert

[Editor's Note: The following account is not to be considered a complete history of the final chapter of Mennonite alternative service in Russia, but rather a testimony of a man who did much in freeing several hundred young men of draft age from military service, and in helping them to find alternative service of a constructive nature. The writer of this editorial note was one of those young men and knows from personal experience what a blessing went out in the Mennonite communities and in the courtrooms from men like Elder Joh. P. Bueckert, who now resides in Canada.

The Mennonite settlement to which this article refers was known under the name Arkadak, in the province of Saratov, located on the west side of the Volga River, and was founded only a few years before World War I. Conditions described in this brief summary were not identical with those in all Mennonite settlements. At some places, no doubt, the freeing of young men from military service during the early régime of the Soviets was more difficult. At other places some young men were imprisoned and even shot. But the procedure was everywhere more or less the same. Formerly the Mennonites were freed from military service and were expected to do alternative service as a religious group. After the Revolution each individual, Mennonite or otherwise, who had conscientious scruples against participation in war was required to make application to the People's Court in advance, and then was examined. This was the procedure during the early "democratic" stage of the Soviet régime. Soon exemption from military service was made impossible. Now that thousands of Mennonites have emerged from the other side of the "iron curtain" we should soon be able to get the final report of this tragic chapter. Professor Jacob Sudermann of Goshen College translated the following account from the German.—*Cornelius Krahn.*]

Since 1880 the Mennonites of Russia did their alternative service in forestry service and other activities of national importance. With the beginning of World War I this privilege was extended also to other branches of service. Our Mennonite Alternative Service Board with David J. Klaassen as chairman was called to Petersburg for a discussion relative to ways of service that would prove to the Russian people who were sending their sons into military service that we were not disinterested spectators but ready to serve our country with all our strength and property as long as it would not involve the violation of our conscience.

Soon a new branch of service was agreed upon. A number of our young men had already volunteered to do Red Cross service in medical corps or civilian hospitals. In fact this had been the case as early as the Russo-Japanese War. Again there were some who were ready to serve in this way. At the outbreak of the war there were three nonmilitary organizations under the Department

of Interior that sponsored hospital work. These were the All-Russian Union of the Nobility, the All-Russian Union of Cities, and the All-Russian Union of Rural Areas. They had organized on a large scale to transport the wounded from the front, place them in hospitals, and care for them. Hundreds of trains, which, except for physicians and nurses, were serviced completely by Mennonite boys of the Sanitary Service, shuttled from the front to the hospitals with the wounded. There were, however, many Mennonites who preferred not to do this type of service. These were given service in the forests as fire-fighters, as workers in sawmills, and also as supervisors over military prisoners working in the forests. Some young men were perhaps a thousand miles from home for three years or more. A significant number of Mennonite men were employed in the cities in government service, especially in Moscow. The All-Russian Union of Rural Areas had a large center in Moscow with one building for people in service who needed a rest and another for government workers. Both buildings had a purely Mennonite administration. Their provision rooms were never empty. When I was permitted to live there for a week in May, 1918, there was a great scarcity of bread. Only one-fourth pound per person was the ration, but there was such an amount of stored butter that the pieces of butter were almost as large as the rations of bread.

When the Revolution began there was no immediate change as far as the service was concerned. However, in the fall of 1917 all men in service soon returned home because the Soviet government was dismissing all the old army personnel and recruiting the Red Army. Consequently Mennonite boys also returned from their alternative service. Presently the young men were again called to the colors. The Soviet government had issued a decree that all religious groups which refused to do military service because of conscientious objections must appear in court to gain release from such service. Soon an Association of Religious Groups was organized with Tschertkov, the former secretary of Leo Tolstoy, as secretary. The Mennonites in Northwest Russia had joined this association. It was due to Tschertkov that this body was organized and that it carried much weight in Moscow. To my knowledge no sincere objector was sentenced in either the Saratov or the Samara districts. A few eventually got into the army because of neglect or ignorance, but these, too, were recalled when energetic intercession was made for them in the courts.

This organization in Moscow, called *Obyedinyeney Soviet Religiosnech Obchtin i Grup,* had succeeded in obtaining permission to intercede for those who had been persecuted because of religious beliefs. It was even granted the privilege of giving bond for those who were in prison and of appealing their cases in the court so that they could be freed. I myself was entrusted with this responsibility from 1918 to 1925, and in the course of that time was instrumental in freeing many Mennonites and also a few Russians. Of the 200 young people that I represented, about seventy-five had to undergo a second investigation, but in the end all were freed. At first these young men were assigned different types of work, but later all were placed as workers on Soviet farms near our colonies.

At first, the court procedure was not difficult. I was able to free 114 men simultaneously without as much as having them appear at the hearing in their behalf. I merely had to give our reasons for nonparticipation in military service to the judge and the witnesses. I included a bit of Mennonite history and told them that the Mennonites had more than once migrated to another country because of this doctrine peculiar to them. Upon conclusion of this narrative a favorable decision was given.

In South Russia it was not so easy to gain exemption from military service and in some cases it was not granted at all. But only a few of our young people took up arms under the pressure. But also in Northern Russia conditions became more stringent. In March, 1925, when I brought my last group of young people to the court at Saratov, I was warned in a friendly but earnest way to give up sponsoring the cases of these young men. The judge said privately, "You have spoken well, but in the long run you will not be able to keep pace with us." In August we emigrated and my successor appeared in court only once or twice before he was captured and sent into exile. It became more and more difficult to be freed from military service, and if exemption was granted the alternative service closely resembled a concentration camp. Prior to and during World War II most of the Mennonite men, whether of military age or not, were exiled into forced labor camps.

BOOK REVIEWS

History and Customs of the Amish People. By H. M. J. KLEIN. York, Pennsylvania: The Maple Press Company, 1946. Illustrated, 7¼ x 11¾. Pp. 74. $5.00.

Meet the Amish: A Pictorial Study of the Amish People. By CHARLES S. RICE and JOHN B. SHENK. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press, 1947. 7¼ x 10¾. Text, 21 pp. Pictures, 96 pp. $5.00.

These two books are worthy additions to the increasing number of studies treating the Amish with sympathetic understanding and fairness. The first is a de luxe edition limited to 990 numbered copies. It was designed by Howard N. King, and the art, much of it sketched on an Amish farm, is by Howard Imhoff, of York, Pennsylvania. The type, 14 point Bell, was completely set by hand. Inside the covers is a two-page sketch of an Amish farm. Scattered through the book are full-page sketches; smaller ones introduce chapters. At the top corner of each left-hand page and the bottom corner of each right-hand page are the two designs most common in Pennsylvania Dutch art, the tulip and the peacock, both done in bright colors.

The author, H. M. J. Klein, for thirty-five years served as professor of history in Franklin and Marshall College, Lancaster, Pennsylvania, and is the author of a number of books on local and church history. He has a deep respect for the rare qualities and the accomplishments of the Amish. It is evident that he has read the standard works on the Amish and is familiar with the MENNONITE QUARTERLY REVIEW and with the writings of J. W. Yoder, C. Henry Smith, and Walter Kollmorgen. In the essential points and in his interpretations the author presents an accurate picture. He presents that which the title suggests, the history and customs of the Amish people, with, however, a major emphasis on customs. "Master Farmers," "Farm Buildings," "Religious Life," "Selections by Lot," "Religious Services," "Shunning," "Appearance and Garb," "An Amish Wedding," "Youth Problems," "Schools," "Holidays," and "Language" are some of the chapter headings.

There are a few minor errors, however, which could have been avoided if the manuscript had been read by several competent Mennonite historians. For instance, he states that Jacob Ammon "introduced the use of hooks and eyes instead of buttons on the clothes of men." As a matter of fact, the Amish merely conserved the styles that were common among them at that time.

It is doubtful if the following practice mentioned on page 42 has ever been generally observed in Amish churches.

> A Bishop's assistant stood up, shook hands with the sister upon his left at the table and kissed the brother upon his right, and from brother to brother and from sister to sister the kiss went around the congregation. The last sister who has no one to kiss, goes forward and kisses the first one, thus completing the chain of unity.

Nor is it likely that the objection to the wearing of the mustache was or is based upon the argument that it "would interfere with the holy kiss."

Meet the Amish, in the words of the publishers, is the "first comprehensive pictorial study of the hard-to-photograph Amish." This statement is no exaggeration, for in this book there are several hundred excellent photographs on almost every phase of Amish life. Their dress, buildings, farms and farm products, farm animals and farming operations, homes

and furnishings, carriages, farm sales, amusements, weddings, schools, and barn raisings are pictured. One section on personality studies is especially revealing. The only area of their life to escape the camera was worship.

Charles S. Rice, the photographer, has taken pictures of the Amish for *Life, Holiday, Pageant,* and other magazines. He has Amish relatives and thus understands his subjects. John B. Shenk, who wrote the text for the book, learned to know the Amish in his father's blacksmith shop in Lancaster, Pennsylvania. He is now a teacher of industrial arts education at the State Teachers College, Millersville, Pennsylvania, but spends considerable time studying living conditions of the Pennsylvania people.

The preface states the purpose of the book to be the presentation of a pictorial study of a group "which has changed very little in general living habits for the past two hundred years. Their society is stable, generally self-sufficient, and almost completely independent of the changing, turbulent world all about it. . . . The fact that these people represent a unique, successful, and very stable type of society within our own American society makes them a tremendously interesting community which invites acquaintance."

In the text, the Amish of eastern Pennsylvania are located geographically and their appearance and apparel are described. A section on religious development accurately traces the growth of the Anabaptist movement, the development of the Mennonite Church, and the separation of the Amish from the Mennonite body. Other sections present group characteristics, church districts, weddings and diversions, education, birth and death, occasional happenings, occupations, and the Pennsylvania Dutch language.

Mr. Shenk in eighteen pages has presented an accurate and a surprisingly complete picture of Amish history, belief, and practices. The reviewer was unable to detect any errors in the details presented or in the interpretations given. The reader marvels at the large amount of detailed facts the author has at his command; only those who have lived close to the Amish and have studied their life carefully could write as Mr. Shenk does. The reviewer, therefore, heartily recommends this book to anyone who wishes to "meet the Amish."

Mennonite Research Foundation. Melvin Gingerich.